Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California Lutheran University

Professional Services Division

December 17, 2003

Overview of this Report

This report provides background information about the recent COA/NCATE merged visit that took place November 15-19, 2003 on the campus of California Lutheran University. The visit was unique for the State of California, the Commission and COA because it was a follow-up of an earlier COA/NCATE merged visit.

On November 13-17, 1999 the COA conducted a continuing accreditation visit at CLU. The visit was a merged COA/NCATE visit and was an Initial Accreditation visit for NCATE. The COA took action to support the merged team recommendation of Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations at its meeting in January 2000. The two substantive stipulations were removed at the March 2001 meeting of the COA and full Accreditation was granted.

At the March 2000 meeting of the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE a decision was made to not grant initial accreditation for the institution. Within two years of the initial NCATE visit the institution decided to request another initial visit that led to the November 15-19, 2003 merged accreditation visit. Thus, while it was a COA/NCATE merged visit, the only official accreditation recommendation and decision will be for NCATE. The COA team members wrote a formative report as information for the COA. Therefore the findings of the merged team are not to change the COA accreditation status for CLU.

As a result of the visit November 2003 the merged COA/NCATE team found that all six NCATE Standards were met with certain areas for improvement noted. The team recommendation will be considered by the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE at the March, 2004 meeting.

Merged COA-NCATE Visit

The merged visit was based upon the partnership agreement reached between the COA and NCATE. The first partnership agreement was developed and signed in 1989. The Partnership was renewed and revised in 1996 and renewed again in October of 2001. The Partnership Agreement requires that all California universities who are NCATE accredited or who desire NCATE accreditation are to participate in reviews that are merged. The agreement also states that the teams will be merged, will share common information and interview schedules,

and will collect data and reach conclusions about the quality of the unit and programs in a collaborative manner. The accreditation team is to take the common data collected by the team and adapt it according to the needs of the respective accrediting bodies. Under the partnership agreement, California universities are not required to submit Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations, because program reviews are part of a state accreditation process. The current partnership agreement allows institutions the option of responding to the NCATE unit standards. Since this was an initial NCATE visit only the Institutional Report comprising of institutional background information, statement for the Conceptual Framework and responses to the six NCATE Standards was used for the visit. COA team members did, at times, refer to the Commission approved credential documents for some specific information.

The Accreditation Visit

The dates for the visit were set jointly by NCATE, the Commission's Administrator for Accreditation and the institution. The COA consultant, Philip Fitch, was assigned to the institution in the spring of 2002, and met with the institution in the Fall of 2002. In the Spring of 2003 there was a leadership meeting on campus between the consultant staff, administration, program coordinators, faculty and staff. During the meeting discussions were held regarding the Institutional Report (IR), logistics for a merged visit, team size, interview schedule, document room and other organizational arrangements. Later that spring the CTC Administrator for Accreditation and COA consultant selected six COA team members to participate in the visit. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability in using the six NCATE Standards and for their additional experience in merged accreditation visits. NCATE appointed a team chair in the Spring of 2003 and three other team members in September of 2003. A NEA/CTA representative for the visit was selected at that time as well. On Sunday, September 21 and Monday, September 22 the COA Chair, NCATE Chair and COA Consultant conducted a pre-visit to the campus. Arrangements for technology were discussed, the interview schedule was reviewed and arrangements for team and document rooms were completed.

Three of the NCATE team members, the COA Consultant and three COA team members arrived on Friday evening November 14. The seven had a working dinner on Friday evening and on Saturday the merged team members spent the morning and afternoon reviewing documents on campus and using the extensive web-site data base. During this time the fourth NCATE team member and two other COA team members arrived. There was short team meeting at the hotel that evening followed by another working dinner. One COA team member had to return home on Sunday morning because of illness. Team members met in the team room of the hotel on Sunday morning, visited the campus during early afternoon and returned to the hotel at 4:00 p.m. The University President hosted the team for a reception at his home at 5:30 and at 6:30 the team walked to campus for a "Poster Session Walk About" following the various credential programs in the unit or School of Education. At 8:30 the team returned to the

hotel and completed a discussion and calibration activity on each NCATE Standard and the Conceptual Framework.

Beth Graybill, Director of Professional Services Division at the Commission also was present on the campus. Beth served as a second consultant for the visit. She assisted team members in editing portions of the preliminary drafts and provided clarification when requested or needed.

On Monday and Tuesday team members completed nine field visits, conducted individual and group interviews, reviewed documents in the team room and completed extensive web-site searches on campus.

Accreditation Decision

On Sunday night, Monday night, late Tuesday afternoon and Tuesday night the total merged team (4 NCATE, 5 COA, 2 Consultants and 1 CTA Representative) met and discussed the findings on the Conceptual Framework, each of the six NCATE Standards and all elements of each standard. Preliminary team findings were charted standard by standard – element by element. On Tuesday evening each team member presented her/his preliminary writing to the total team. Edits were made, language was added or in some cases deleted and by late Tuesday evening most of the team report was drafted. The team co-chairs lead a discussion on team findings late Tuesday evening. There was total team agreement that all standards were met and total agreement on the area for improvement. On Wednesday morning the team met at 8:00 am to consider any further writing for the NCATE report and for the COA formative statement. The co-chairs for the visit, along with the two COA consultants presented the team findings on campus at noon to the University President, Provost, Dean and two Associate Deans.

Background

In 1959, the Pederson Ranch, located against the hills of Thousand Oaks, began its transformation to today's learning community of California Lutheran University. Richard Pederson, the son of Norwegian immigrants, donated his ranch to "provide youth with the benefits of a Christian liberal arts education in a day when spiritual values can well decide the course of history." The ranch now forms the heart of the 290 acre campus in the Thousand Oaks community. The first classes were held in 1961.

California Lutheran University, a liberal arts institution, is one of 28 colleges and universities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America. The University is situated in Thousand Oaks, a community of 120,000 that is situated in Ventura County, midway between Santa Barbara and Los Angeles and 15 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. The population of Ventura County, which has experienced a 10 percent growth since 1990, is 770,630. The population of the county is 63 percent Caucasian, 23 percent Hispanic or Latino, 7 percent African-American, 6 percent Asian, and 1 percent Native American.

The University mission statement reads that CLU is a "diverse scholarly community dedicated to excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies. Rooted in the Lutheran tradition of Christian faith, the University encourages critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason. The mission of the University is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice."

California Lutheran University offers 36 majors and 28 minor programs within the University's three schools: the School of Business, the School of Education, and the College of Arts and Sciences. There are four divisions and 20 departments within the College of Arts and Sciences. The University had a fall 2003 enrollment of 2920 students, 1920 undergraduates and 1000 at the graduate level. A total of 1779 were female and 1141 were male. Approximately 700 (24%) are resident minority. There are 46 international students representing 19 countries.

In the fall of 2003, the University listed 122 full-time faculty. Of this number 82 percent hold doctorates while 93 percent hold terminal degrees. Females comprise 46 percent of the full time faculty while 13 percent are ethnic minorities.

At the time of this NCATE visit, the School of Education has 20 faculty who hold rank. There are at this time, two unfilled tenure track positions. Of this group, four were representative of minority groups. The SOE also has 2.5 FTE in special grant funded appointments. One of these members is a minority.

The School of Education

In accordance with the mission of the University, the School of Education seeks to develop "reflective, principled educators who STRIVE to serve as mentors and models for moral and ethical leadership; think critically to connect theory with practice; respect all individuals; include and respond to the needs of all learners; value diversity; and empower individuals to participate in educational growth and change."

California Lutheran University is authorized by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to offer credentials under the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970. All programs are currently post-baccalaureate. CLU offers initial teacher credentialing in multiple subject (elementary) with an emphasis is CLAD (cross-cultural language and academic development) or BCLAD (bilingual cross-cultural language and academic development emphasis in Spanish); and single subject (secondary) credentialing with CLAD or BCLAD. Single subject options exist in all identified credential areas for candidates who have established subject matter competency by program or exam. California Lutheran has state approved single subject program areas of English, social science, mathematics and physical education. Candidates may apply to the credential program only, or to a combined credential/M.Ed. program. An initial

certification program and/or Master of Science degree also exists in special education. CLU offers the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe (Preliminary Level) (Professional Level II) Education Specialists credentials and Resource Specialist certificate. It is possible to complete the multiple subjects credential and the Master of Science in Special Education degree at the same time. The Professional Level II credential requires two years of teaching before application. At the advanced level, California Lutheran offers credentials in Educational Administration, Curriculum and Instruction, and Counseling and Guidance. It is possible to receive a credential, an M.A. or a Ed.D. in Educational Administration at CLU. The Ed.D. program began in 2002 and has not yet graduated a cohort. The Counseling and Guidance program offers credentialing and/or a Master of Science degree with emphasis in Pupil Personnel Services. Current teachers may also pursue a Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction where they might specialize in one of seven areas: cross-cultural language and academic development; curriculum coordination; educational technology; elementary education; reading; secondary education; or subject area specialization. Certificates are available in cross-cultural language and academic development, reading, resources specialist, child welfare and attendance, and computer concepts and applications supplementary authorization.

The School of Education has a total fall 2003 enrollment of 610 graduate level candidates, 487 females and 123 males. Of this number, 350 are enrolled as full time candidates, and 260 are part-time. Of the 610 candidates, 152 (25%) are representative of minority populations. Approximately 16 percent of the candidates are of the Lutheran faith.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS REPORT

N C A T E

_____

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

FIRST ACCREDITATION VISIT TO:

California Lutheran University
Thousand Oaks, California
November 15-19, 2003

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

Nancy L. Williams, Chair
Clara Burrows
Deborah Kraker
Gwendolyn Trotter

State Team:

Lamar Mayer, Chair
Katy Gould Anderson
Cathy Buell
Jim Reidt

State Consultants

Phil Fitch
Beth Graybill

NEA Representative

Leslie Littman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   Conceptual Framework

II.   Findings for Each Standard

        Standard 1

        Standard 2

        Standard 3

        Standard 4

        Standard 5

        Standard 6

III.   Report to Committee on Accreditation

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT
NCATE 2000 Standards

Institution: California Lutheran University

	Standards	Team Findings	
		Initial	**Advanced**
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	M	M
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	M	M
3	Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	M	M
4	Diversity	M	M
5	Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	M	M
6	Unit Governance and Resources	M	M

M = Standard Met
NM = Standard Not Met

PART I. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Introduction

The School of Education at California Lutheran University has developed with its constituents and adopted a conceptual framework that is consistent with the mission of the University.   The unit seeks to develop reflective, principled educators who STRIVE to
- **S**erve as mentors and models for moral and ethical leadership.

- **T**hink critically to connect theory with practice.

- **R**espect all individuals.

- **I**nclude and respond to the needs of all learners.

- **V**alue diversity.

- **E**mpower individuals to participate in educational growth and change. The vision of the reflective, principled educator is realized when the unit put the Vision into **ACTION** through engagement in
- **A**ctive Learning

- **C**ollaboration and Connections

- **T**echnology Supported Learning

- **I**nquiry and Critical Examination

- **O**ngoing Reflection and Development

- **N**exus of Theory, Research and Practice

The unit's tenets of "models for moral and ethical practice" are supported by the writings of Fenstermacher, Goodlad, Schon, Sergiovanni, and Carter, among others.   Cuban, Dewey, Paul, Darling-Hammond, and Friere provide a foundational knowledge base for candidates to "think critically" about their practice. The works of Noddings, Kozol, Oakes and Lipton support the "respect for all" strand, while writings of Clark, Gardner, and Igoa inform the unit with respect to the belief that all students can learn. Lindsey, Robins and Terrell's work Cultural Proficiency along with the model suggested in this book frame

the work being done by the unit in the area of diversity. Many of those listed above, along with Fullan and Evans, have been cited by CLU in their commitment to build leadership and capacity in their candidates.

Shared Vision

The mission of California Lutheran University is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice. This mission aligns well with the School of Education conceptual framework.
The conceptual framework was originally developed in 1999.   Discussions occurred over an 18 month period at that time. Part-time faculty and advisory committee members as well as School of Education faculty report being involved in discussions about the conceptual framework at that time. Candidates across all program areas as well as the wider professional community of school based personnel report knowledge and understanding of the framework.

Coherence

The conceptual framework is reflected in all course syllabi. Matrices have been developed which show the alignment of the conceptual framework with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of program completers in the initial and advanced programs. The conceptual framework is reflected in the assessment instruments used throughout the programs.

Exhibit A. Expectations for Reflective, Principled Candidates at California Lutheran University

STRIVE	KNOWLEDGE	SKILLS	DISPOSITIONS	K-12 STUDENT LEARING
Serve as mentors and models for moral and ethical leadership	Knowledge of research and best practice as outlined in prof, state, and institutional standards	Ability to achieve candidate expectations outlined in program goals, leadership skills	Commitment to model best practice and to serve as mentor to others; view teaching and ed leadership as moral activity	Students experience improved instruction; students take responsibility for own behavior

Think critically to connect theory to practice	Mastery of disciplinary, content, and ped. knowledge as outlined in prof, state, and institutional standards	Ability to think and write critically; ability to apply theory to practice in educational settings	Willingness to critically examine and reflect on one's practice	Students exhibit critical thinking skills and higher level learning
Respect all individuals	Knowledge of student backgrounds, cultures, strengths, learning needs	Ability to relate to all students; authentically assess student learning	Care and respect for students, parents, colleagues, and other professionals	Students fell valued and learn respect for others
Include and respond to the needs of all learners	Knowledge of human development; knowledge of individual differences and learning needs	Ability to use multiple instructional strategies	Commitment to helping all students achieve potential	Students experiences an equitable classroom environment; assessments contribute to improved learning
Value diversity	Knowledge of culture and its various manifestations; understanding of self and richness of diversity	Ability to align policies, practices, and procedures to achieve cultural proficiency	Commitment to achieving cultural proficiency	Students prepared to take their place in the global community
Empower individuals to participate in educational growth and change	Knowledge of best practice as outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards	Ability to lead and empower others for leadership	Commitment to renewal, growth, and change; desire to empower others	Students empowered to achieve learning goals

Professional Commitments and Dispositions

Dispositions are embedded within the descriptions of the STRIVE components and are listed separated. (See chart above).   Candidates self-report on the acquisition of these characteristics.   Field assessments across program areas also reflect commitment to the dispositions. Employers speak positively in surveys to the professional dispositions of the CLU candidates.

Commitment to Diversity

Commitment to diversity begins on the University level and extends through each program area in the School of Education.   Three components of the conceptual framework address the importance of a commitment to diversity. Syllabi, which reflect the conceptual framework, include knowledge bases and assessment measures which address diversity.   Field instruments assure that candidates in programs are assessed in the performances related to diversity. When asked about what is important for them to know and be able to do, candidates often speak first to the importance of understanding the issues related to diversity and education.

Commitment to Technology

The School of Education is housed in the newly opened Spies-Bornemann Center for Education and Technology. This 6.2 million dollar facility houses Macintosh and PC labs which are also "smart" classrooms. Distance learning equipment, and a television station with editing and control rooms, are also available. Expectations for technology use exist for both candidates and faculty in all programs. Candidates in many programs are putting their work on webfolios. A survey was distributed to candidates of all programs from 1997-2002 which measures the use of various technological vehicles in School of Education courses.   Candidates reported increased use of webfolios, electronic library resources, chats, distance learning, word processing, e-mail, internet courses, and Powerpoint.

Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional and State Standards

The conceptual framework of California Lutheran is knowledge based and aligned with the California Commission on Teaching Credential Professional Preparation Standards. These CCTC standards have been aligned with national standards of NCTE, NCTM, MENC, AAHPERD, and NCSS.   The credentialed programs at California Lutheran have been submitted and approved by the CCTC.

PART III.   FINDINGS FOR EACH STANDARD

Standard 1:   Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

> *Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

The partnership agreement between NCATE and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing exempts California institutions from submitting subject matter programs for review by the Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) affiliated with NCATE. California has developed standards, subject matter requirements, and candidate expectations for thirteen single subject (secondary) teaching areas and subject matter requirements for the "liberal studies" multiple subject (elementary) programs. The state requires that all subject matter programs be grounded in the subject matter requirements of the Specialized Professional Associations and in the Student Academic Content Standards that have been approved by the California State Board of Education.

California candidates may demonstrate content knowledge in a subject area through one of two statutory avenues. The law provides for candidates to meet content requirements through the completion of a Commission approved program of subject matter or through the passing of a Commission approved content area examination (CSET). CLU has Commission approved subject matter programs for elementary subject matter (liberal studies) and in five single subject areas, i.e., English, mathematics, music, physical education, and social sciences with the bilingual option available for each area. All subject matter programs are aligned with and recognized by the following SPAs: NCTE, NCTM, MENC, AAHPHERD, and NCSS. In addition, CLU admits qualified candidates for all credential areas who have established subject matter competency by program or exams.

All CLU candidates must pass the subject matter examination (CSET, Praxis, SSAT) or complete a Commission approved subject matter program before admission to the credential program and before student teaching. CLU data indicate that approximately 50 percent of all single subject candidates use the examination route and 50 percent complete an approved subject matter program. Because of the California requirement, 100 percent of those using the

examination route must have passed approved subject matter examinations before admission. Over two-thirds of the multiple subject candidates complete the Commission approved "liberal studies" program. Again, because of California requirements, 100 percent of those taking the multiple subject examinations must have passed before admission to the program. CLU has had an approved "liberal studies" program for over eight years and a newly approved elementary subject matter program that began in fall 2003. Candidates' files contain documentation of their status in meeting the subject matter examination requirement as well as a log of contracts and understandings between them and the CLU faculty and/or staff.

Because of the federal law, *No Child Left Behind Act (HR1),* CLU has begun to require the CSET examination for *all* multiple subject candidates starting fall 2003. However, approved programs in "liberal studies" will continue to exist. Single subject programs are not affected by the NCLBA since all approved subject matter programs are comparable or equivalent to an academic major.

CLU's Teacher Preparation Department offers Commission approved programs for the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II Education Specialist Credentials and a Resource Specialist Certificate. Upon entry, Level I candidates are required to have a 2.75 undergraduate GPA and must demonstrate content knowledge competence before final admission through either a Commission approved subject matter program (may also earn the Basic Credential) or the Commission approved subject matter examination (CSET, Praxis, SSAT). Because of the admission requirement, Title II reports for program completers from 1999 through 2002 verify the 100 percent pass rate for those using the examination route. Upon exit, Level I completers apply for the Level II credential. After two years of teaching experience where completers must continue to demonstrate content knowledge, skills, and dispositions and complete required coursework, candidates may add the Level II credential. Level II requirements must be met five years from the date of the issuance of the Level I credential. Resource Specialist candidates must hold the Learning Handicapped or Severely Handicapped credential to be admitted. Candidate files document these content knowledge requirements.

Throughout the program and upon exit, candidates submit, through their portfolio that is called a webfolio, artifacts (e.g. course assignments tasks and lesson plans) to document content knowledge. In interviews with candidates, positive comments were made about the feedback they received on artifacts, in some cases almost immediately, from CLU faculty. Generally, feedback was given no later than two weeks from the date of the candidate's submission of the artifact. Student teaching evaluations also give evidence of candidates' subject matter competence. Interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers, site coordinators, and school level administrators as well as survey data from candidates upon exit indicate satisfaction with the candidates' content preparation.

The following data, extracted from the *Teacher Education Graduate and Employer Survey Results-Fall 2003* show the "adequately prepared" ratings by both graduates and their employers about content knowledge competence:

Question 1: How prepared were you to know and understand the subjects of the curriculum at your grad level(s)?

Scale: 3-well prepared; 2-adequately prepared; 1-somewhat prepared; 0-not at all prepared

	Graduate Response (N=25)				Supervisor Response (N=16)			
Rating	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0
Percent		36	48	16	0	50.0	37.5	12.5	0
	Median	2			Median	2		

Continuing candidates (credentialed teachers pursuing the master of education degree) must maintain a 3.0 grade point average in the graduate coursework and demonstrate proficiency in the capstone experience which may be the defense of portfolio evidence or the presentation of a research project at a poster session.

Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel

Commission approved advanced level programs at CLU are in Curriculum and Instruction for the certificate in reading and in technology; Counseling and Guidance for the Pupil Personnel Services credential; and Educational Administration for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential at the master's level and the recently implemented Educational Leadership program for the Professional Administrative Services credential at the doctoral level. Entry into all master's degree programs require an undergraduate, upper-division grade point average of 3.0. Entry into the doctoral program also requires a master's degree in education or a related field. Throughout each program candidates provide documentation of the application of their content knowledge competencies in the various assignments, including practicum/internship hours, as outlined in course syllabi. Evidence of projects, with candidate reflections, are displayed in the webfolios. At exit, candidates defend webfolio evidence that demonstrate their competencies in meeting the program specific content expectations.

Data from follow up surveys of candidates and graduates, such as the *Advanced Studies Graduate Survey-Spring 2003*, and interviews with school administrators indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the level of content knowledge demonstrated by the other professional school personnel. When asked to comment on the strengths of the programs offered by the Department of Advanced Studies (comments were not broken out by program), 134 graduates from 1997 through 2003 listed 179 observations overall. Thirty-eight comments were reported concerning the high degree of relevance of the curriculum and strong application of theory and practice.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

In keeping with the mission of CLU, the School of Education is committed to developing **reflective, principled** educators who **STRIVE** to:

III.   **S**erve as mentors and models for moral and ethical leadership.
IV.   **T**hink critically to connect theory with practice.
V.   **R**espect all individuals.
VI.   **I**nclude and respond to the needs of all learners.
VII.   **V**alue diversity.
VIII.   **E**mpower individuals to participate in educational growth and change.

CLU translates this vision into **ACTION** through candidate engagement in:
•   **A**ctive Learning
•   **C**ollaboration and Connections
•   **T**echnology Supported Learning
•   **I**nquiry and Critical Examination
•   **O**ngoing Reflection and Development
•   **N**exus of Theory, Research and Practice

The following data are an example of the responses contained in the *Report of Exit Survey Data – Teacher Education (Fall 2000-Summer 2003)* that reflect the perceptions of candidates in the initial and advanced programs regarding their **ACTION** engagement in their methods courses and fieldwork. The report reflects the responses from candidates in both the initial and advanced programs. Raw data sample sizes per program were not given.

Active learning: *To what extent have you been an active participant in constructing your own learning through collaborative learning, interdisciplinary exploration, field-based learning, reflective opportunities, experiential learning, or interactive discussions?*

4 - **Excellent**   **3** - **Good**   **2** - **Fair**   **1** - **Poor**

Program	Fall '00	Sp/Sum '01	Fall '01	Sp/Sum '02	Fall '02	Sp/Sum '03
Initial						
Teacher Preparation	3.3	3.3	2.3	3.4	3.7	3.6
Special Education	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.8	4.0
Advanced						
Educational Leadership	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6
Counseling and Guidance	3.5	3.2	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.4
Curriculum and Instruction	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3
Unit Overall						
School of Education	3.4 (n=59)	3.5 (n=67)	3.3 (n=20)	3.6 (n=100)	3.6 (n=29)	3.6 (n=97)

The pedagogical content of the teacher preparation programs is guided by the six tenets of CLU's conceptual framework and is stated at the beginning of each course syllabus. Faculty and department minutes document the decision-making process over the last three years to commit to a master template for all syllabi with objectives and primary texts for each course listed so that as stated in the institutional report, "No matter who teaches the course, those elements are to be in place."

Course syllabi in all areas of teacher preparation show the alignment of the pedagogical content with the conceptual framework, program standards, California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), and INTASC principles. Course syllabi and candidate webfolio data also verifies this alignment. The following example from the document *Plan for Alignment with Teaching Performance Expectations* illustrates this alignment:

Strive	CA State Standards	INTASC Principles	Knowledge	Skills
Serve as mentors and models for moral and ethical leadership	General education core in liberal studies and in content areas; learning theories; pedagogy; K-12 content standards, etc. (CSTP*1,2,5,6)	Central concepts of discipline; student learning; assessment; communication strategies; reflective practitioner (principles 1,2,6,8,9)	Knowledge of research and best practice as outlined in professional, state, and unit standards	Ability to achieve candidate expectations outlined in program goals; leadership skills

*California Standards for the Teaching Profession/Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)

The institutional report indicates that CLU is in the process of transitioning from the six California Standards for Teaching Professionals to organizing the pedagogical coursework and field experiences around the 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Under SB 2042, the unit must provide evidence that documents *how* and *when*, throughout the program, candidates demonstrate "satisfactory performance" for each TPE. Course syllabi, evaluation forms from fieldwork, and candidates' webfolios document the varying stages of implementation of the TPEs. Information in the *Plan for Alignment with Teaching Performance Expectations* also indicates where in the courses and fieldwork candidates are to provide performance evidence for meeting the TPEs. The progression for candidate performance is recorded using the indicators observation or acquired or utilized for each TPE in the various courses and field experiences.

In addition to the assessments included in the coursework, candidates are empowered through a web-based process, known as CLUES (California Lutheran University Education Student's Program and Portfolio Guidebook) to "keep, organize, and present the required portfolio documents for the Benchmarks," The CLU portfolio assessment is formative and is a continuous process of monitoring a candidate's growth at each stage from admission to completion. The assessment benchmarks are used by candidates to plan, assess, and reflect upon their experiences in impacting P-12 learning. The benchmarks in CLU's initial level assessment process are labeled Benchmark A - Admission; Benchmark B – Begin Methods; Benchmark C – Complete Methods; and Benchmark D – Done with Student Teaching. Specific requirements, e.g., portfolio evidence and fieldwork evaluations are stated for each benchmark. Evidence in candidate files, interviews with mentor teachers and CLU faculty, and webfolio presentations by candidates document the process. Aggregated data from requirements at each level are not always available.

The internship programs for candidates who are employed while completing their teacher education program follow a similar progression but are completed over a two year period. At this point the webfolios are being scored, but there is not aggregated or disaggregated data available for candidates or across programs.

Also evident in the fieldwork are the opportunities candidates have to model the appropriate use of technology. Observations of class sessions (at the Ventura Center), candidates' lesson plans, and webfolio artifacts provide supporting data that demonstrate that candidates are using technology in their teaching.

A content specific methods course is offered in the multiple subject program while the required methods course for the single subject (secondary) candidates is generic rather than discipline specific. Support for content specific pedagogy in the single subject program could not be verified, leaving concern that candidates may not be getting the discipline specific pedagogy they need at the secondary preparation level.

Lesson plans and the delivery of those lessons for course assignments in the field experiences and interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers, school level administrators, and alumni give evidence of candidates' application and mastery of pedagogical knowledge. The *Summary of Fieldwork Assessments--Teacher Education, Benchmark D (Fall 2000-Spring 2003)* provides evidence of how well candidates have been doing in demonstrating pedagogical knowledge and skills. In general, the fieldwork evaluations indicate that candidates' performance by Benchmark D reflects "Maturing Practice."

When interviewed, several school level administrators stated that they purposely choose to have student teachers from CLU. The administrators said that they have had student teachers from two or three other campuses and without naming them, they were more than willing to state their preference in the CLU programs. They went on to say that having the CLU student teachers on their campuses allowed them to observe and build their reservoir of quality potential candidates for teaching vacancies, such as at one high school where the principal had 170 vacancies to fill over a two year period. They stated that knowing that CLU completers are among the applicants proved a tremendous help in the hiring process.
.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (now the required Teacher Performance Expectations) provide the overall program goals for the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills required of candidates. Candidate feedback about how well prepared they felt they were to meet these expectations is evident in the *Exit Survey Results-Teacher Education,* a self-report form of data collection.

Question: How well were you prepared to accomplish the following? (Items were rated on a 4-point scale, with 4 being the high. Means are reported.)

Teacher Preparation	Fall '00	Sp/Sum '01	Fall '01	Sp/Sum '02	Fall '02	Sp/Sum '03
Engage and support all students in learning.	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.7
Create and maintain an effective environment for student learning	3.7	3.6	3.0	3.6	3.9	3.7
Understand and organize subject matter for student learning.	3.4	3.7	3.0	3.8	3.7	3.7
Plan instruction and design learning experiences for all students.	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.6	3.7
Assess student learning	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.5
Develop as a professional educator.	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.6	3.7	3.6

The teacher preparation program at CLU, for both initial and advanced programs, encourages candidates to develop their own educational philosophies. This developmental process begins with the introductory coursework and continues throughout the program as the candidates are being prepared to teach to the California Teaching Performance Standards/Teaching Performance Expectations (aligned with the INTASC Standards); subject matter program standards (aligned with and recognized by the SPAs: NCTE, NCTM, MENC, AAHPHERD, NCSS, and CEC); and the California State Board approved Student Academic Content Standards. Syllabi for the methods courses, lesson plans for and evaluations of candidates' fieldwork experiences, and webfolio artifacts provide the evidence for showing how candidates demonstrated their competencies in meeting these standards. The candidates' reflections about their experiences provide rich insights into their professional growth.

Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

Candidates in the advanced programs in Curriculum and Instruction for the certificates in Reading and in Technology; Counseling and Guidance for the Pupil Personnel Services credential; and the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services credentials must all maintain a 3.0 grade point average in their graduate/credential coursework. Because California's partnership agreement between NCATE and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing exempts California institutions from submitting subject matter programs for review by the Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) affiliated with NCATE, all credential programs are approved by the Commission. The state requires that all subject matter programs meet the subject matter requirements of the SPAs, i.e., CEC, IRA, CACREP, ISTE, and ISLLC, and the Student Academic Content Standards that have been approved by the State Board of Education. The programs for school counseling, reading, technology, and school administration all are Commission approved.

Documentation of performance by candidates in the advanced programs, i.e., Counseling and Guidance, Curriculum and Instruction, and Educational Administration, is found in the candidates' webfolios, fieldwork evaluations, and

upon exit through the comprehensive examinations or webfolio defense or thesis project. The average passing rate on the comprehensive examinations for all programs for the last three years is 82.5 percent. Educational Leadership doctoral candidates are required to complete a dissertation and final defense. There have been no completers, as yet, in this program.

Survey responses from 134 Advanced Department graduates from 1997 and 2002 indicate the following about their professional preparation.

Scale: 5-extremely important 4-very important 3-somewhat important 2-little importance 1-not a factor

Counseling and Guidance

Counseling and Guidance graduates evaluated their preparation on six program goals. Overall, the ratings ranged from the high 3's to low 4's. The highest rating was found in "Counsel students individually and in groups about their personal and social development," with a mean of 4.33. Lowest ratings were given to "Understand factors contributing to and methods and programs for preventing student failure in schools," with a mean of 3.73.

Curriculum and Instruction

In Curriculum and Instruction, graduates rated their preparation on the seven goals with means well above 4.9. Highest ratings were give to "Use the most current and research-based teaching and assessment techniques to meet the educational needs of all students" and "Reflect on your own professional practice and its effectiveness with a variety of students," both with means of 4.49. The lowest rating was for "Understand social and cultural influences that impact students' learning experiences and environment," with a mean of 4.19.

Educational Administration

The Educational Administration graduates rated their preparation on their eight goals from the low to mid-4's. The highest mean ratings were found in "Lead, facilitate and collaborate with others in planning, development and realization of shared goals and objectives" and "Use group facilitation skills for problem/conflict resolution and consensus building, both with means of 4.46. The lowest rating was found in "Garner and effectively manage fiscal resources and business services aligned to address student needs and school goals," with a mean of 4.09.

Dispositions for All Candidates

For both the initial and advanced level programs, candidate dispositions are embedded in CLU's conceptual framework under the elements of STRIVE. These dispositions include modeling best practice as a "reflective, principled educator"; viewing teaching and educational leadership as a moral activity,

showing care and respect for all individuals, commitment to help all students achieve potential, commitment to achieve cultural proficiency, commitment to renewal, growth, and change; and desire to empower others.

The mandated Teaching Performance Expectations require candidates to demonstrate competencies in their programs by documenting their attainment of the TPEs. Teaching Performance Expectation 11-*Social Environment* requires documentation that show how candidates (1) create a physical environment that engages all students; (2) establish a climate that promotes fairness and respect; (3) promote social development and group responsibility; and (4) establish and maintain standards for student behavior. Teaching Performance Expectation 12-*Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations* and Teaching Performance Expectation 13- *Professional Growth* require candidates to demonstrate competencies in (1) working with families to improve professional practice, (2) working with colleagues to improve professional practice; (3) demonstrating knowledge of professional responsibilities, (4) reflecting on teaching practice and (5) establishing professional goals and pursuing opportunities to grow professionally. Formative assessment of dispositions is evident in the feedback given by course instructors to assigned tasks displayed in candidates' webfolios while the formal summative assessment is evident in the evaluation of the student teaching or internship experience. The dispositions of candidates are screened upon entry through the personal statement and interview as well as in candidate educational philosophies as they gain experience in the foundations as well as methods courses.

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

The program goals for teacher education have student learning as the focus. In the foundation courses, candidates learn about the characteristics and the development of P-12 students and the factors that affect their development, achievement, and behavior and apply their learning's in related tasks, e.g., an assignment for candidates to interview an individual whose primary language is not English. In the methods courses and the introductory course to student teaching, candidates continue building their professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions and begin to document in their lesson plans the impact they make upon student learning.

When candidates advance to full-time student teaching or during the internship experience, they are expected to continue documenting the impact they have upon student learning in their responses to the reflection questions in their lesson plans, The feedback from mentor teachers and university supervisors provide insights on candidates developing competencies in connecting theory and practice. Candidates' fieldwork evaluations give evidence of their level of performance as **not yet observed**, practice **inconsistent** with standard expectations, **beginning** practice, **maturing** practice, and **experienced** practice. A matrix of ratings of the fieldwork evaluations at Benchmark D for program completers for the last three years indicates that most candidates demonstrate

maturing practice in engaging and supporting all students in learning. In assessing student learning, the ratings reflect **beginning** practice.

At the present time, the evidence that candidates have a positive effect on student learning is documented in the webfolio of each candidate. CLU plans to use the webfolio technology to conduct a comprehensive analysis of P-12 student work. A collection of paper and electronic student work samples has begun but was not available at this visit.

Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel

Candidates in the master's programs for School Counseling and Guidance, Curriculum and Instruction, and Educational Administration and the doctoral program for Educational Leadership are assessed on their ability to meet the program goals that require them to demonstrate competencies in creating environments supportive of student learning for ALL students. Their portfolios/webfolios are assessed upon their completion of the coursework and in the fieldwork evaluations by the site and university supervisors. Candidates are interviewed upon exit and must demonstrate competencies through the comprehensive examinations, webfolio defense or thesis or project at the master's level, or dissertation and final defense at the doctoral level. Webfolios and field experience evaluations for candidates in the various advanced programs provide documentation of the level of attainment of the program goals and performance expectations for the areas.

The evaluation ratings for the cumulative field experiences, e.g., EDAD 578A and 578B, of candidates in other school roles indicate a mean competency rating between "some" and "extensive" for the program goal to create positive learning environments in schools. The mean competency rating on the fieldwork evaluations for candidates' knowledge of the developmental levels of P-12 students, the diversity of students, families, and communities, and the familiarity of candidates with the social, cultural, and policy contexts in which they practice from fall 2000 through summer 2002 is also between "some" and "extensive." Data reflect evaluations of candidates from fall 2000 through summer 2002.

In the *Report of Exit Survey Data (Fall 2000-Summer 2003),* the overall strengths cited in the various programs are for reflection, outstanding faculty, practical assignments, attention to the needs of diverse learners, and integration of theory and practice.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The School of Education has presented evidence to document that candidates in all programs, at the initial and advanced levels, have the appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to become reflective, principled educators who strive to
- **S**erve as Mentors and Models for Moral and Ethical Leadership
- **T**hink Critically to Connect Theory with Practice
- **R**espect All Individuals

- **I**nclude and Respond to the Needs of All Learners
- **V**alue Diversity
- **E**mpower Individuals to Participate in Educational

Evidence from surveys, self-report assessments, individual webfolios, interviews, admission test scores, comprehensive exams scores, and field experience evaluations, document success of all CLU candidates in relationship to performance requirements set by California and California Lutheran University.

C. Recommendation: Met (Initial and Advanced)

D. Area for Improvement:

Consistent support for the development of content specific pedagogy during the student teaching blocks for the single subject (secondary) teaching areas was not evident.

Rationale: The required methods course for the single subject candidates is generic rather than discipline specific and CLU supervisors may or may not be specialists in the specific content area of the candidates. Thus it is difficult to verify that candidates are acquiring the content specific pedagogy they need to successfully teach in their field.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

A. Level: **Initial and Advanced**

B. Findings:

Assessment System

It would appear that the unit has designed an assessment system as identified in institutional report (Standard 2) and the linked exhibits. Senior administrators indicate that Standard 2 of the institutional report, with its many links, was presented as the comprehensive assessment plan. Although a coherent, concise, and consistently presented plan was not unavailable, many documents were presented to illustrate the multiple assessment tools, instruments and processes being used by California Lutheran to collect data on performance and operations. The institutional report (IR) reported that "*the SOE Assessment Plan is designed to choose and monitor the development of the best possible candidates to work with P-12 students. The System has been fully created, and is nearly installed. The process of installation that will be completed in 2003-2004, with full implementation expected in 2004-2005.*"

Minutes from the Department of Teacher Education faculty meetings in October 2003, September 15, 2003, October 2002, April 2002, February 2001, March 2001, April 2001, September 2000, November 2000, indicate several discussions regarding the benchmark process and the number of candidates receiving assessments at the A, B, C, D and E benchmark levels for the initial program and benchmarks 1, 2, 3, and 4 for advanced programs. The benchmarks identify admission (Benchmark A or 1), Advancement to Block (Benchmark B), Completion of Methods (Benchmark C), Done with Student Teaching (Benchmark D), Exit from M.Ed. Program (Benchmark E) in the initial program. In the advance program benchmarks, the designations are defined by each program.   The portfolio process was a prominent discussion agenda item in Department of Teacher Education faculty meetings.   The discussions ranged from connecting syllabi to the conceptual framework to the inclusion of syllabi objectives or competencies on the webfolio.   The webfolio is an electronic portfolio system used across the initial and advanced program.

With the exception of the webfolio, exit survey results and alumni survey, varied assessment documents appeared to be uneven in terms of implementation, data collection, analysis and use of data for program improvement.   Such documents and exhibit links included:
- Teaching Performance Expectations

- Capstone Courses

- CSET , Praxis and SSAT scores
- SOE Admissions Reports
- CLUEs Webfolio Rubrics-Teacher Education
- CBEST
- Advanced Studies Webfolio Rubrics
- Comprehensive Exam Passing Rates

Further interviews revealed that the system had been designed by a few administrators, and then presented to program directors, and later to faculty, with input sought from both of these bodies and external advisory groups regarding the assessment system. The assessment system appeared to be designed by putting together an array of program contextualized assessments. The institutional report (IR) indicated that a group of unit administrators and faculty were involved in the design of a system with the conceptual framework and CCTC standards as the organizing features.

An uneven documented assessment system did emerge from the triangulated interview process. The interviews were conducted with senior administrators, teacher education candidates and faculty.   The assessment system that emerged from the interview process appeared to start with inquiry and move through admissions, course work, field experiences, program exit, credentialing, and employment. Assessment was built into the different programs with common assessments of admissions rating/scoring and personal statements, exit interviews, alumni surveys, and employer surveys. Additional assessment tools and measurements were developed on a program basis.

Unit and other meetings were identified by senior administrators as evidentiary data to support the development and involvement of faculty in the assessment design and utilization process. Minutes of the Department of Education Faculty meetings do highlight faculty discussions and concerns for the benchmarks and the portfolio process. These meetings were documented in an exhibit titled *Department of Education Minutes*. These minutes are abstracted and presented below to illustrate attention to the unit wide benchmark process. The matrix cells with XXXXXX indicate opportunities for assessment of data collection and analysis that were not utilized or fully discussed, at least as reflected in the minutes. Also the use of data elements and assessment data was limited in departmental discussions.   The area of concern is the limited consistent systematic data collection and analysis at the initial and advanced level.

Group Meeting Date	Assessment Plan/Discussion /Action Items	Data Elements, Collection and Analysis	Use of Data Elements and Assessment Data
Department of Teacher Education Faculty Meeting Minutes October 20, 2003	STRIVE and placing competencies on the webfolio Paul needs to be notified so he can run the aggregate data	Beth handed out results for Benchmark B Attachment: Fall 2003 Benchmark Process	XXXXXXXXXXX
Department of Teacher Education Faculty Meeting Minutes September 15, 2003	Benchmarks— Benchmark B-Adviser C is being read by the various methods faculty D is being read by supervisors E is not done formally but through the completion and presentation of their projects B criteria does not meet course work objectives	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXX
Department of Teacher Education Faculty Meeting Minutes February 2003	Expected completers for 03 spring -24 Evening Credential Program students-Benchmark 4 -Benchmarks 1,2, and 3 will be done by supervisors 46_D-525 &535 instructors will do CSTP portion of the portfolio review faculty and supervisors will also participate 7_D Benchmarks alternate assessment piece (TPE) 24-C Benchmarks in elementary 10-C Benchmarks secondary When will we be interviewing B-Benchmarks? CSET has now come into use. Only four single subject area this year. SSAT or Praxis If the student has taken SSAT or Praxis and not passed, and then they have until June to pass the old exam for MSAT,	FYI-Title II Completers report for 01-02 MS via Liberal studies program-33 MS via exam-53 Total Multiple Subject Completers • English 8 • Math 4 • Social Studies 7 • Science 3 • Health 4 • Art 1 • Business 2 • German 1 • Total Single Subject completers 30 • Special Education 17 • Total: 133	XXXXXXXXX

Group Meeting Date	Assessment Plan/Discussion /Action Items	Data Elements, Collection and Analysis	Use of Data Elements and Assessment Data
	English, Math, Science, and Social Science.		
Department of Teacher Education Faculty Meeting April 2003	Benchmark exit appointments	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXX
Department of Teacher Education Minutes October 14, 2002	Arrange for reading CLUEs portfolios Benchmark D EDTP 525/535 instructors will work on the six CSTP entries in the candidates' web folios in the future Beverly will feed the 6 single subject candidates' webfolios and exit them from Benchmark D

Supervisors will work with candidates on the other entries. Faculty will coordinate exit interviews Estimated numbers: 6 Single Subject, 22 Multiple Subject

Benchmark "D's" are scheduled for the week of December 16-20

Benchmark B_ We don't have a firm estimate of how many B candidates we have. Non-capstone Bs need to be scheduled for late Nov

Attention to Webfolio CLUES standards

The assessment piece is being implemented to provide constant feedback for the further development of the program and for evaluation of how we are doing in our program

Attachments: Benchmark "B" Oral | Question was raised about the discrepancy in numbers between Simi and Ventura Groups. They started out more even but some in the Ventura group dropped | XXXXXXXXXXXX |

Group Meeting Date	Assessment Plan/Discussion /Action Items	Data Elements, Collection and Analysis	Use of Data Elements and Assessment Data
	Presentation Readiness Checklist to be returned to Paula Shattuck Benchmark Block Webfolio Review		
Department of Teacher Education Faculty Meeting Minutes Monday, April 8, 2002	Benchmark B- discussion of process— How are we going to run benchmarks this semester? It was decided that the methods interview should be the culminating activity Methods interview- Liberal Studies undergrads number about 20 Interview process should carry more weight. We did not intend the benchmark to be used as the only assessment of suitability to continue in the program, but it should be used as an assessment. Readiness for advancement to methods is based on foundation grades, Webfolio evaluation and Webfolio oral presentation (interview)	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXX

Minutes from other unit meetings indicate a greater degree of attention to data collection and analysis. Minutes and assessment areas from exhibit titled *Minute Examples of Standards 2 and 6* are as follows:

Group Meeting Date	Assessment Plan/Discussi on /Action Items	Data Elements, Collection and Analysis	Use of Data Elements and Assessment Data
School of Education/Facult y Business Meeting September 8, 2003	Millie Murray- Ward is developing tables to document links with STRIVE, knowledge skills and dispositions. The six benchmarks are incorporated	Exit survey data are being entered as available-summary was distributed-Carol has done analysis of open-ended questions and e-mailed Program directors receive a copy of report every semester	Those present were instructed to identify three areas for improvements for the retreat

Group Meeting Date	Assessment Plan/Discussion /Action Items	Data Elements, Collection and Analysis	Use of Data Elements and Assessment Data
	into the assessment process		
Faculty Meeting Minutes September 8, 2003	Annual faculty review forms Process is called for in Faculty handbook but hasn't been followed up recently	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXX
School of Education/Dean's Cabinet Meeting August 20, 2003	Plan to implement Provost's plan regarding part-time instructors and evaluation of instructors	Recommend that 25% be evaluated each year—recommend a mid-semester self-evaluation for part-time instructors	XXXXXXXXX
Advanced Studies Meeting May 12, 2003	Alumni Survey was reviewed and approved Self evaluation rubric for basic Educator Computer Use was approved	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXX
Department of Teacher Education/Faculty Meeting November 12, 2001	Fall exit reviews reviewed	'B" Benchmark "Interview" will be conducted by the adviser. It was decided that this is a part of the process for moving to methods not the final step. There is a place on the benchmark where student remediation can be written if needed. This is a pilot project not a change in policy.	XXXXXXXXXXXX

All candidates at both the initial and advanced studies level moved through benchmarks with the Teacher Education Department being more formalized than the Department of Advanced Studies.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

The following documentation, listed in the institutional report (IR) was presented as evidence of an assessment system with some identified data elements and potential for data elements, data collection, analysis, and evaluation.

1) *Assessment System Data Collection Activities and Instruments* with components of admissions, completion of coursework, field experiences, credential, and employment. This exhibit linked to the institutional report is a matrix listing assessment activity, assessment evidence, schedule (identified as continuous) and instruments. Assessment activities identified were extensive, ranging from location of field study approved by program director to completion of employer survey activity.

2)   *Assessment of Teacher Education Candidates* with benchmarks of admission, advancement to block, completion of methods, student teaching, and exit from M.Ed. Program. This exhibit, also linked to the Institutional Report, is a matrix identifying benchmarks for teacher preparation candidates. The benchmarks move from Benchmark A-Admission, Benchmark B-Advancement to Block, Benchmark C-Completion of Methods, Benchmark D-Done with Student Teaching and Benchmark E-Exit from M.Ed. Program.

Candidate performance identified in the Credential Handbook (p. 9) covering multiple subject, single subject and education specialist indicate the following California Lutheran requirements.

1) Take and pass all required coursework

2) Satisfactorily complete student teaching

3) Pass the Benchmark portfolio process

4) Have an academic exit interview with your advisors

Candidates completing an approved subject matter preparation program do not take a content specific exam. It was not clear as to the exact number of candidates taking the exam and what happens to those who apply for admission but do not initially have a B.A. from an approved program and have not passed the exam. However, during interviews, faculty and students indicated that all students must complete the benchmark portfolio process and exit interview. Aggregate and disaggregate data was not available on the portfolio process, though data were available on scores on field instruments and self-report scores from exit interviews.

3)   *Assessment of Advanced Studies Masters and Doctoral Candidates* with categories of Candidate Degree, Admission, Completion of Course Work, Field Experiences, Exit, Credential, and Employment. The candidate degree areas include the Masters in Counseling and Guidance, Educational Leadership, Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Administration. The doctoral area includes Educational Leadership. This matrix included elements such as minimum 3.0 grade point average as well as portfolio competencies.

Interviews with faculty and students indicated that data is collected at six benchmarks. These benchmarks include admissions, completion of course work, field experience, program exit, credential application and employment. Assessment instruments at the initial and advanced level and aligned with these benchmarks include:

- Personal Statement Form

- SOE Initial Interview Forms

- Professional Letters of Recommendation Forms

- SOE Admissions Rating Rubrics

- Graduate Record, CBEST, MSAT, Praxis or CSET

- Student Electronic Portfolio/Webfolio Defense Rubric

- Comprehensive Examination Rubrics (Advanced Programs only
- Final Presentation Rubric
- RICA

The matrices presented in the institutional report provided a view of data that the unit is currently collecting. The many data elements, collected as part of the assessment system, have not been fully integrated into a coherent and operationalized data collection and analysis system as evidenced in interviews and a review of unit and program minutes.

Aggregated and disaggregated data were not available on portfolio scoring. Data were available as related to employer and alumni survey, some data on comprehensive exams, benchmark scoring data (not disaggregated by program), self-reported data from candidates at exit of programs, and data from field assessments (not all disaggregated) done from 2000-2003. A Datatel administrative software package is used to manage data. Most of the data elements listed above are not a part of the Datatel process, however. It was unclear as to how program directors and faculty will utilize the Datatel software to collect and analyze data. Also unclear was how such data moves from the Datatel system to actual use by program directors, faculty and students.

In respect to assessments and their connection to the conceptual framework, candidates and faculty during interviews at the initial and advance level detailed the use of benchmarks. Several examples of assessment appeared in the initial teacher preparation and advanced programs. For example, a document titled *Assessment System for Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions –Teacher Education* indicated Benchmark Decision Points, Knowledge, Evidence of Skills and Dispositions with portfolio, GPA and exit interviews as primary assessment tools/tasks (Teaching Performance Assessment Tasks). Aggregated data was not always located to support the movement from matrix presentation to actual consistent data collection, analysis and use overall. Candidates did self-report at exit on their acquisition of the dispositions that are reflected in the conceptual framework.

It appears that the unit has not reached the point of validating assessment tools and procedures in the assessment implementation process. Data were not available suggesting a study of assessment instrument, process or plan related to quality or credibility. Minutes were examined to ascertain such discussions. There was one occurrence in the School of Education, Advanced Studies Meeting, on October 6, 2003. A reference was made to employer data. This employer data reference was as follows:

"We sent postcards to all the students from alumni asking who employed them so we could send their employer a survey. There were 70 useable cards that came back. 38 percent responded. The survey is very difficult to read and much too busy... It was very incomplete data. Next time we should choose our competitors, CSUN, Azusa Pacific and the University of Laverne for the Survey."

The many assessment forms and matrices would indicate that the unit collects data regularly. These forms and matrices indicate a collection of information as related to:

- Assessment System Plan for Data Feedback to Programs for Monitoring and Improvement
- Course Evaluations
- School of Education Yield Data
- Exit Survey Data
- Teacher Education Graduate and Employer Surveys
- Letters of Recommendation
- Portfolio Evidence
- Teaching Performance Assessment Tasks (student teaching)
- Exit Interviews
- Student Teaching Evaluations
- PDS Evaluation Focus Group(s)

A timeline (Data Collection Points) was indicated in a matrix titled *Assessment System Plan for Data Feedback to Programs for Monitoring and Improvement.* The timeline did not indicate dates or time frames. This matrix indicated benchmarks, data collected, purpose, data collection point, person(s) responsible for collection and person(s) responsible for analysis. This matrix could very well serve as the management of data collection and analysis process; however it was still unclear as how this is being used at the present time.

Use of Data for Program Improvement

Assessments and evaluations used for management and improvement of the operations and programs of the unit were identified. Two extensive documents titled (1) *Assessment System Data Collection Activities and Instruments* and (2) *Assessment System Plan for Data Feedback to Programs for Monitoring and Improvement* were provided. The components of documents include:

Document (1)	*Document (2)*
• Admissions	Assessment Activity
• Completion of Course Work	Assessment Evidence
• Field Experiences	Schedule
• Credential	Instruments
• Employment	

Such documents would suggest a management system. Also, aggregated data was provided from an alumni survey and employer surveys, and some benchmark data. However, limited evidence was available to illustrate use of the data to improve or manage the unit assessments and evaluations. Minutes were available, but were not detailed in nature. Such minutes included limited references to assessment data and the two systems identified in aforementioned documents.

Links in Standard 2 also provide *Program Reflections and Action Plans* in the various programs. These documents reflected the source for information on a program, the program strength and needs, the goals to be addressed and the data based action plan steps to be taken or taken already. For instance, in the Curriculum and Instruction program, sources for information were listed as course evaluations, market exploration, advisory committee feedback, program enrollment data, and exit interviews. As a result of the data collection, P.E. and ECE specializations were eliminated, and Curriculum and Instruction was redesigned to include more leadership training. It is unclear who prepared these documents, however.

Interviews with faculty and students also indicated that several program changes had resulted from assessment and evaluation data. The data was collected using the alumni survey, employer survey and course evaluations. Changes, not documented in minutes, but shared during the interview process include:
> 1) Course Evaluation data was used to make decisions regarding faculty who were not well suited for specific courses.
> 2) Student evaluation of field experiences resulted in a calendar change with students allowed to start the school year onsite in P-12 settings.

Again, somehow the data collection and analysis works in places, though the plan is not inherently coherent and, as yet, systematized.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has varied assessment systems/plans in place. A portfolio and benchmark process has been implemented for the initial and advanced programs. Also exit and alumni surveys were additional common assessments across all programs. Evidence revealed intent to collect and analyze data systematically. Program improvements have been made using data, though some of the data has been informally collected and shared. However, overall assessment practices did not support a coherent and, as of yet, systematized process for collecting, analyzing and using data. Limited systematic use of aggregated and disaggregated data in both the initial and advanced program was noted.

C. Recommendation: Met at initial and advanced

D. Areas for Improvement:

(1) A coherent and consistent assessment plan has not been implemented systematically.
Rationale: The unit, by its definition, has an assessment plan. In each program, benchmarks have been developed and across the programs various programmatic and operational data are collected. Multiple and varying data collection devices and documents emerge, however, leading to issues of coherence. There is a lack of consistency in the collection and analysis of the data, at least as evidenced in the minutes, which could hinder the effectiveness and efficiency of the unit's commitment to quality programs and candidates, though evidence provided through interviews, observations, poster presentations by candidates, and the data that have been aggregated show that the unit and its candidates are functioning and operating at a level which provides quality programs and candidates.

(2) Portfolio data have not been systematically aggregated and other data has not been always disaggregated by program.
Rationale: Evidence was provided from each program to suggest where changes were being made based on information gathered. The information was presented in narrative form, however, having come from journals, surveys, course evaluation and conversations. There were no aggregations of portfolio scores (using the webfolio rubrics) and other data had often not been disaggregated by specific program. Such data might be helpful in assessment of candidate/program strengths and areas for needed improvement.

Standard 3.   Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings

Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

California Lutheran University in May of 2002, entered into a partnership agreement with Simi Valley Unified School District to develop a Professional Development School so candidates might focus on student learning during their student teaching experiences. As a Professional Development School, the Arroyo certified staff serves as cooperating teachers working with CLU student teachers. In the spring of 2002, the Arroyo Steering Committee, comprised of cooperating teachers, two CLU staff members, parents, and student teachers formed a focus group to discuss the partnership, establish futuristic goals for Arroyo students and Simi Valley Unified School District, and outline educational opportunities for candidates and faculty at CLU.   The comment from teacher candidates, Arroyo teachers, and Arroyo parents was strong.

Student teachers have responded by indicating that they have been well received as prospective teachers by Simi school officials. Cooperating teachers and parent responses indicate that CLU candidates possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to aid in classroom procedures and instruction. By mid-September 2003, all 20 graduates of the Professional Development School cohorts were hired as teachers; eleven were hired into Simi Valley Unified School District, four were hired into Los Angeles Unified School District, three into Conejo Unified School District, and one in each Rio Elementary District and Oxnard Elementary District. Not all CLU initial candidates, however, are placed at Arroyo, for student teaching. This initial foray into a Professional Development Schools demonstrates CLU's commitment to strong field experiences.

Candidates complete field experiences, student teaching, and internships in surrounding districts including Simi Unified School District, Moorpark Unified School District, Conjo Unified School District, Oak Park, Los Vergo, Pleasant Valley, Rio Unified School District, Oceanview, Hueneme, Oxnard Elementary, Union High, and Ventura Unified. Geographically, Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Conjo are the closest to CLU in that they are within eight to ten miles and are used most often. Hueneme, Oxnard Elementary, and Ventura University are approximately 30-35 miles from the campus.

Supervisors, coordinators, and site administrators report a three-way collaboration between the university, school districts, and school sites regarding

student teacher placements. The student may request a placement site or geographical location, though preferences are not guaranteed.

The Director of Student Teaching is the liaison for placements. The Director notifies the district personnel of the number of candidates available and their content area or the placement needed to meet credentialing requirements. The district contacts the proposed school site principal for validation of vacancy within the school and an alignment with the cooperating teacher's content area. The district and school site have the option to decline a candidate based not only on availability, but also on the number of placement requests. At this point, the Director of Student Teaching and the candidate are notified of the placement by the school site principal. It was noted that placement notification was not always timely for both cooperating teachers and candidates.

Interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers, principals, and examination of student files indicate the University is receptive to the needs of candidate but also the best placement options for educational growth. Documentation is available documenting that candidate's placement or school site has been adjusted for reasons such as the need for a required content area experiences and because of dispositional issues. There are concerted efforts between the university and school site personnel to ensure that candidate placement is made with consideration for meeting the standards, the university's mission, and STRIVE elements.

Interns (those employed as they complete credentialing) are allowed to complete their fieldwork requirements at their employment site. The intern may complete additional fieldwork assignments during the summer at a year-round school or in an alternative setting. Only one experience may be completed at the candidate's employment site.

Each semester, the University invites cooperating teachers to a seminar where the benchmarks, assessment procedures, candidate and cooperating teacher responsibilities, and CLU's conceptual framework and theoretical model are discussed. This meeting is optional. However, CLU does provide the cooperating teachers with a Cooperating Teachers Handbook that includes information about all aspects of student teaching.

It was found that many of the cooperating teachers were alumni from CLU, were adjunct faculty at CLU, or were affiliated with CLU as members of committees. Faculty who teach the methods courses, which include fieldwork, and teacher education faculty provide much of the supervision of the candidates.

<u>Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical</u>

<u>Practices</u>

Candidates build a webfolio, an assessment and professional reflective document and learning tool to illustrate their growth and development in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the CLU program The webfolio is instrumental in illustrating the candidate's ability to link theory to practice and to align the conceptual framework and STRIVE to theory and practice.

Prior to the methods coursework, candidates have field experiences in each of the foundation courses. The foundation courses for multiple subject candidates are:

- First and Second Language Acquisition:

- Culture and Diversity in Education;

- Psychological Foundations of Education; and

- Child Growth and Development.

The foundation courses for single subject candidates are:

- First and Second Language Acquisition;

- Culture and Diversity in Education;

- Psychological Foundations of Education; and

- Adolescent Growth and Development.

Field experiences in the foundations courses are linked to content knowledge by activities such as observations and case studies. Candidates receive three hours credit for these courses. The course instructor assigns field study related to the content area. The candidate does have the opportunity to request a site or experience.

In Introduction to Student Teaching Multiple Subjects (elementary), the candidate is at the field site for four hours, four days a week. Candidates attend seminars and classes at the CLU on Thursday evenings and Friday so they might reflect upon experiences with other student teachers. The concurrent courses for multiple subjects are:

- Leadership and Management in Diverse Classrooms;

- Reading and Language Arts in Diverse Classrooms ; and

- Math and Science in Diverse Classrooms.

Single subject (secondary) candidates are at the school site three days a week for four hours concurrent with course work and a seminar at CLU. For single subject candidates, concurrent course work include:

- Curriculum and Design in diverse Classrooms

- Leadership and Management in Diverse Classrooms; and

- Reading in the Content Areas.

Upon completion of the methods block, candidates present documentation for the Benchmark C requirement that includes the *Introduction to Student Teacher* component. It is at this point that both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor assess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the candidate through mid-term and final examinations. Failure to pass Benchmark C may result in half-time student teaching for extended time, postponing student teaching to repeat the introductory course, or exiting from the program.

Course syllabi outlining lesson plan formats, readings, reflective writings, and methods of assessment clearly outline candidate expectations. Syllabi include CLU's mission and vision. Rubrics are available that correlate coursework to state standards and in some cases correlation has also been made to the professional organization and/or NCATE standards.

California Lutheran University's conceptual framework theme "Preparing reflective, principled educators who STRIVE" is clearly reflected in course work and assessments. As evidenced by triangulating syllabi, documentation in student files, and interviews, CLU's field experiences, at both the initial and advanced levels, expect candidates to both understand the conceptual framework and demonstrate the behaviors embedded within its tenets.

In respect to technology, California Lutheran University received a three-year "Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology" grant of $1,032,232 given by the United States Department of Education, to partner with Walnut Canyon School (Moorpark Unified School District); Charles Blackstock School (Hueneme School District) and Santa Susana High School (Simi Valley Unified School District) in technological training. Indeed, technology is evident in all aspects of field experiences and student teaching, as can be found in course syllabi and evidenced in candidate assessment. The candidates' webfolios are a vehicle for their preparation for benchmark requirements, exiting requirements, and are later used as an employment tool. They also use technology in communication with faculty. Student work (P-12) is also included in the teacher education webfolios.

The School of Education views field experiences as an integral part of all credential programs and some master's programs. In most cases, faculty supervisory appointments are in their credential area. This appointment is part of their workload. Cooperating teachers and school personnel who hold relevant credentials work in unison with CLU faculty advisors to support candidate field experiences. Part-time institutional faculty are also utilized in the supervision of candidates in their own particular areas of expertise, be that instruction, administration or counseling. The Director of Student Teaching (in the case of the Teacher Preparation Program) or the appropriate program directors interviews potential supervisors and makes recommendations to the Dean. The Dean is the final decision maker on the hiring of field experience supervisors.

According to the Institutional Report, individuals selected as cooperating teachers will be:

- Experienced and effective in supervising credential candidates;

- Knowledgeable and understand current educational theory and practice, the university's expectations for supervising teachers, state-adopted content standards and frameworks, and the developmental stages of learning to teach; able to model collegial supervisory practices that foster success among credential candidates; and
- Able to provide reflective practice.

The criteria for the cooperating teacher's selection will include:

- Recommendation by site administrator;

- Willingness to participate in CLU sponsoring training;

- Tenured member of district;

- Hold a CLAD or BCLD clear credential;

- Experienced at their current grade level;

- Competent in the use of instructional technology; and

- Preferably experienced as a cooperating teacher.

California Lutheran University documents student placement and the cooperating teacher assignment using Excel. Currently, the University is implementing Datatel as a method of tracking candidate progress in conjunction with student files. There was no evidence through recorded data, however, that cooperating teachers fulfilled the criteria required by the university or that the cooperating teachers were credentialed in the area of the candidates they were supervising. Inconsistent reports were given, as well, on whether interns in the programs were consistently assigned on-site mentors who could provide them with pedagogical assistance as necessary.

Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help all Students Learn

California Lutheran University's School of Education's primary goal is to develop professional educators who are reflective and connect theory to practice. The developmental approach or theoretical framework is based on "Survival and Skill" stages. The characteristics are defined as follows:

I. Survival Stage Characteristics: development of instructional leadership (classroom organization and routines).
II. Skill Stage Characteristics: designing well-written lesson plans and learning for all students.
III. Strategy Stage Characteristics: development of facility to enhance group and individual learning.
IV. Synergy Stage Characteristics: holistic environmental functioning focusing on developed competencies.

Stage one and two are the survival stages. Stage three and four are the skill stages.

In conjunction with the "Survival and Skill" stages, California Lutheran University has implemented a benchmark program called California Lutheran University Education Students' program (CLUES). The program details the sequential benchmarks from admission to exiting the program with employment. Also included is the Master's of Education benchmark. The protocol defines coursework, assessments/requirements, and links to the conceptual framework. The chart below illustrates the program.

Assessment System for Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions - Teacher Education

DECISION POINT	EVIDENCE OF		
	KNOWLEDGE	SKILLS	DISPOSITIONS
Benchmark A: Admission	Transcript verifying at least a 2.75 undergraduate GPA; capstone assessment from undergraduate program for CLU candidates	Letters of recommendation; verification of pre-professional experience	Interview; personal statement
Benchmark B: Advanced to Methods Block	3.0 grade point in prerequisite courses Passage of CBEST (basic skills exam) Passage of subject matter exam or verification of approved subject matter program	Portfolio evidence	Benchmark Interview
Benchmark C: Completion of Methods	3.0 GPA Portfolio evidence	Portfolio evidence Evaluation of Presentation on one standard; Introduction to student teaching evaluation (clinical experience) TPA* Tasks 1 and 2	Benchmark Assessment of growth; statement of goals
Benchmark D: Done with Student Teaching	3.0 GPA Portfolio evidence	Portfolio evidence Student teaching evaluation TPA* Tasks 3 and 4 RICA	Portfolio evidence Exit interview Student teaching evaluations Assessment of growth; statement of goals
Benchmark E: Exit from M.Ed. Program	3.0 GPA Presentation of action research project	Portfolio evidence Presentation of research project at poster session	Exit interview
Employment	Follow up surveys: • Graduates • Employers	Follow up surveys: • Graduates • Employers	Survey data (based on Conceptual Framework areas)

* Teaching Performance Assessment Tasks

Because most special education candidates are already contracted, the special education credential program is designed to accommodate individuals who are pursuing credential course work on a part time basis. Teacher candidates can

complete the field study/student teaching requirements in their own classrooms in two years. Typically, ten credits of field study/student teaching are required for the specialist credential in Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe areas. Candidates complete field experiences with linguistically diverse children/youth for 15 hours during the first and second Language Acquisition course requirements. Other courses requiring 15 hours of field experience are Culture and Diversity in Education, Psychological Foundations of Education, Introduction to Special Education, and Lifespan Human Development.

Pupil Personnel Services (School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance) field experiences have increased from 450 hours to 700 hours. The field experience requirements are as follows:
- Field practice in the knowledge and skills provided in leadership, collaboration, and advocacy.
- Practicum shall be a total of 700 hours in setting that are diverse by race/ethnicity and age
- Field practice by credential candidates shall be under the supervision of an appropriate and experienced certified professional approved jointly by the university and school district administration.

The site supervisor evaluates the candidate at mid-term and completes a summative evaluation when all field experience hours have been documented. The faculty supervisor will visit the site and assess competencies, dispositions, working with diverse populations, counseling services, educational services, consultation, and legal aspects through a summative report on a five point scale. The counseling department has hired a graduate assistant to maintain field experience documentation and advisement.

Admission into the intern/evening program basic credential is based on grade point average, letter of employment, three letters of recommendations, admissions review and admissions interview. Candidates must show subject matter competence, pass CBEST, complete U.S. Constitution course, and obtain Certification of Clearance. Candidates in the Intern/Evening Program follow the same Survival and Skill stages as traditional student teachers. The benchmarks are modified to reflect the two-year program.
Candidates in the advanced programs (Educational Administration and Curriculum and Development) are required to complete two field studies. Clinical faculty who hold the relevant credential and model reflective, principled practice supervises these candidates. Attention is given to diversity in placements. The following chart illustrates the requirements.

Field Work Requirements – Advanced Studies

Program	Field Experience / Clinical Practice	IV. Site Selection Process	Supervision	Clinical Faculty Selection	Classes	Planned Sequence	Candidate Assessment Process
Administration Administrative Services: Preliminary	Field Experience I & Field Experience II	Program Coordinator Approval based on adopted criteria	Fieldwork Supervisor (faculty) and Site Supervisor with Credential	Candidate Selects with approval of Program Director	EDAD 578 A EDAD 578 B	2 semesters	Supervisor Evaluation Form (Site Supervisor and University Supervisor)
Administrative Services: Preliminary Professional		Induction Plan & Assessment	Mentor Administrator	Candidate Selects with approval of Program Director	EDAD 589 A EDAD 578 B	1 semester (Induction) 1 semester (Assessment)	Professional Portfolio Presentation
School Counseling	Practicum And Field Studies I and II	Candidate/ Fieldwork Supervisor Collaboration	Fieldwork Supervisor (faculty) and Site Supervisor with Credential	Candidate Selects with approval of Program Director Or Program Recommendation	EDCG 528 EDCG 533 EDCG 534	100 hours practicum 600 hours total at 2 levels	Site Supervisor Evaluation and Faculty Evaluation (mid semester and end of semester)
Reading Certificate (in C& I Program)		Candidate/ Program Director/Instructor Approval (Partner Schools)	On-site mentor approved by instructor Web folio supplement	Candidate Selects with approval of Program Director	EDRD 559; 563; 565 EDSP 532	10 hours minimum for each class	Class assignments and web folio work; Field study verification by Instructor and Program Director

In the initial program, candidates are required to formulate lesson plans based on California standards. Candidates link their philosophy statement to lesson plans, to the standards, and connect theory to practice through reflections of their teaching. Reflection is an evolving skill that permeates field experiences and clinical practice and extends throughout the candidate's teaching program. Candidates in interviews and in webfolio artifacts speak of their need to reflect on their practice. Faculty-to-candidate and candidate-to-faculty communication occurs through personal contact and electronic transmission. The webfolio design allows candidates to submit work, receive feedback, make corrections, and include student work for representation of experiences. Candidate feedback and assessment occurs throughout their student teaching. The cooperating

teacher completes by the assessment for traditional candidates and by the university supervisor does the same for all candidates. Assessment includes formal mid-term and final-term evaluations. Assessments align with the conceptual framework and California Professional Preparation Standards.

The following data was extracted from the California Lutheran University Institutional Report of Teacher Preparation Program report for 2000-2001.

The number of candidates who completed one or more courses during 2000-2001 in a program that included supervised student teaching or internship teaching.

Program	Total	Programs with Supervised Student Teaching	Programs with Internship Teaching
Multiple Subject	141	128	13
Single Subject	98	92	6
Education Specialist	58	37	21
Totals:	297	257	40

Number of candidates in supervised student teaching/internship teaching during 2000-2001.

Program Candidates in	Total	Enrolled Candidates in Supervised Student Teaching	Enrolled Internship Teaching
Multiple Subject	57	46	11
Single Subject	20	17	3
Education Specialist	26	5	21
Total:	103	68	35

Overall Assessment of Standard

Field experiences and student teaching experiences of at California Lutheran University are embedded in the teacher preparation program. These experiences provide candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary. Experiences help candidate relate theory to practice, engage in reflection, gain a firm foundation in California's Professional Preparation Standards, and learn the knowledge, skills, and dispositions embedded in CLU's conceptual framework. Assessment of candidates aligns with the California standards and with the CLU conceptual framework. The supervision by cooperating teachers, faculty, and adjunct supervisors provides the candidates with the feedback necessary for their growth and development. Clinical experiences at the advanced level appear varied, rich, and well considered. The criterion defines the qualifications for cooperating teachers; however, there is no documentation of about the

cooperating teachers.   In addition, in the single subject credential area, supervision by a specialist in the subject area is verified in documentation.

C. Recommendation: Met at initial and advanced

D. Areas for Improvement:

(1) It was not evident in the basic credential programs (i.e. multiple subjects, single subjects,
special education) that cooperating teachers meet the identified criteria.

Rationale: California Lutheran has established criteria for cooperating teachers, but there is no documentation that the cooperating teachers being used meet those qualifications.

(2) It was not evident that basic credential interns were provided with qualified on-site mentors.

Rationale: Interviews with faculty and interns could not confirm that interns were consistently assigned mentor teachers at their employment site from their content areas. Such mentoring is required by California and is consistent with the need to provide feedback and assistance during a "field placement," even if the intern is employed.

Standard 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

The conceptual framework of the unit centers on the **STRIVE** components. Three of these initials relate to the area of diversity: **R**espect all individuals, **I**nclude and respond to the needs of all learners, and **V**alue diversity. Within these three goals, specific professional commitments and dispositions indicate that candidates become reflective, principled educators who "care about their students and seek to understand and build on the strengths, understandings, abilities, perspectives, and styles of learning that each individual brings to the educational endeavor," "commit to developing, using, and promoting positive growth and development for each individual while respecting and understanding differing contributions of all members of the learning community", and "acknowledge their own predispositions, biases, and limitations, and are open to engage in dialogue and examine ideas that form the theoretical foundation of Cultural Proficiency."

Candidates in both initial and advanced programs are expected to understand and address the needs of all students. The initial program focuses upon preparing candidate who can provide a supportive environment in which all students can learn. In the advanced programs, candidates are expected to know and understand social and cultural influences that impact students' learning.
STRIVE elements are interwoven into all courses at both the initial and advanced levels. Course syllabi across all programs relate course objectives and assignments to STRIVE elements. Below each course objective, the relevant letter(s) of STRIVE is bolded.

In the introductory portion of the teacher preparation program, foundations courses provide both knowledge and field experiences related to diverse student populations. For example, in EDTP 508: Students with Diverse Learning Needs and EDTP 500: Social and Cultural Foundations of Education, candidates learn about English language learners and diverse family and cultural backgrounds as well as learning instructional strategies to accommodate these learners. Students are required to observe diverse student populations during these courses. Guidelines and suggestions for field experiences in this portion of the program are made by the course instructor.

As teacher candidates move into methods courses, they apply the knowledge and skills learned in foundations courses to their clinical practice. The lesson plan format requires candidates to include instructional modifications made for English language learners. Special education candidates are also asked to demonstrate lesson modifications to meet the needs of students with disabilities. Assessment of candidates meeting the STRIVE elements related to diversity is done by the instructor in a variety of ways including assigning case studies, a classroom management plan, written lesson plans, requiring field observation notes and giving exams. Candidates are expected to maintain a reflective journal with entries that relate the reflections to the STRIVE elements. In addition to course assignments and reflective journal entries, all teacher candidates are also assessed by the California Lutheran University Education Students assessment program (CLUEs). CLUEs Benchmark C occurs between the introduction to student teaching (EDTP 523: Introduction to Student Teaching-- Elementary and EDTP 533: Introduction to Student Teaching—Secondary), and student teaching (EDTP 540: Student Teaching Elementary, EDTP 560 Student Teaching—Secondary, EDTP 552: Field Study—Elementary and EDTP 572 Field Study—Secondary). Benchmark D occurs after student teaching. Benchmark elements are scored on a five point scale, with five indicating experienced practice and one indicating practice that was not observed. Benchmark C and D data, collected from the previous five semesters, in the area of *Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Student* are below. Mean scores of all candidates, for both benchmark C and D, range from 2.8 to 5.0.

Benchmark C							
Planning Instruction And Designing Learning Experiences For All Students		Fa '00	Sp '01	Fa '01	Sp '02	Fall '02	Sp '03
1. Drawing on and valuing students' backgrounds, interests, and developmental learning	523	4.2	4.4	3.9	3.9	3.2	4.3
needs.	533	4.1	4.1	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.2
2. Establishing and articulating goals and objectives for student learning.	523	4.3	4.3	3.8	3.9	3.2	3.8
	533	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.7	2.9	3.2
3. Developing and sequencing instructional activities and materials for student learning.	523	4.3	4.4	3.8	3.8	3.2	3
	533	4.4	4.2	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.4
4. Designing short-term and long-term plans to foster student learning.	523	3.9	3.9	3.3	3.7	3	3.3
	533	3.8	4	3	3.1	2.8	3.1
5. Modifying instructional plans to adjust for students needs.	523	4.4	4.1	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.3
	533	3.6	3.9	2.8	3	3.1	2.6

Benchmark D		Fa '00	Sp '01	Fa '01	Sp '02	Fa '02	Sp '03
1. Drawing on and valuing students' backgrounds, interests and developmental learning needs.	540	4.4	4.8	4.2	4.4	3.9	3.9
	560	4.6	4.6	3.9	3.5	4.2	4.3
	552	N/R	N/R	5	4.9	4.2	4.4
	572	N/R	N/R	4	4.6	4.8	3.9
2. Establishing and articulating goals and objectives for student learning.	540	4.4	4.8	4.1	4.3	4.3	3.8
	560	4.5	4.8	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.7
	552	N/R	N/R	5	4.9	4	4.6
	572	N/R	N/R	4	4.6	4.8	4.3
3. Developing and sequencing instructional activities and materials for student learning.	540	4.4	4.8	4.2	4.3	4.2	3.8
	560	4.8	4.7	3.8	3.9	4.2	4.7
	552	N/R	N/R	4.7	5	3.8	4.4
	572	N/R	N/R	4	4.7	4.5	4.2
4. Designing short-term and long-term plans to foster student learning.	540	4.3	4.7	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.8
	560	4.8	4.9	3.7	3.6	4	4.1
	552	N/R	N/R	4.7	4.9	3.6	4.4
	572	N/R	N/R	4	4.3	4.8	4.2
5. Modifying instructional plans to adjust for students needs.	540	4.3	4.6	3.9	4.1	3.6	3.6
	560	4.9	4.7	3.4	3.4	4.2	4.3
	552	N/R	N/R	4.7	4.9	3.2	4.4
	572	N/R	N/R	4	4.6	4.3	3.6

In the advanced programs, all candidates take EDGN 502: Current Issues in Education, EDGN 503: Introduction to Special Education, EDGN 504: School Law, EDGN 512: Lifespan Human Development, EDGN 515: Advanced Educational Psychology, EDGN 554: Educational Measurement, EDGN 570: Design and Improvement of Curriculum. Within these courses, candidates explore a variety of educational issues, including issues of diversity. Assessments within these courses include group presentations, papers, student profiles, role-playing, and field observations. In specific advanced program curriculum, candidates extend their knowledge of diversity and apply it within the specific context of their training. Candidates are required to complete field experiences and clinical practice in schools with diverse student populations and document their experiences.

The unit conducts an exit survey of all candidates. Candidates are asked to rank elements on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the highest. In the section related to how well the candidate is prepared to accomplish the STRIVE goals: candidates ranked "respect all individuals" at a mean of 3.9. For "include and respond to the needs of all learners" the mean was 3.8, and for "value diversity" the mean was again 3.8. While there was a slight difference between initial preparation programs and advanced programs, no mean score for any program was below 3.7.

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Demographic data for fall 2003 show 22.5 full time equivalent faculty with 14.5 females and eight males. Of the full time equivalent faculty, one is African American, one is Asian/Pacific Islander, three are Hispanic and 15.5 are Caucasian. There are 46 part time faculty members consisting of 32 females and 14 males. Of the part time faculty, one is African-American, four are Hispanic, and 40 are Caucasian. For the entire college faculty, 122 full time and 112 part-time, 46 percent are female and 13 percent are ethnic minorities. Data on the entire faculty for the past six years indicate that the percent of minority faculty has remained constant and the female population has seen a six percent increase from 1998 to 2003. Attempts to recruit diverse faculty members have seen limited success, largely due to the high cost of living in the area and the relatively low faculty salaries as compared to other private Southern California universities. Efforts to recruit diverse faculty members range from personal recruitment efforts by the former dean as well as advertising in magazines such as *Hispanic Outlook* and *Black Issues*. The university applied for and received an Irvine Grant to help transform the culture for improved diversity on the campus. Outcome A of the Irvine Grant is to increase diversity within the student body, faculty, and staff. Initiatives being pursued by the university without the Irvine funding include a human resources program that would develop a training process for search committees in charge of hiring. With the funding, the plan is for staff development workshops to provide leadership and management skills training in the area of diversity and inclusion. A workshop on the *Cultural Proficiency* model was held for full-time faculty in spring 2003.

While most do not reflect diversity themselves, the faculty does have knowledge and experience in working with diverse student populations. A chart of full time faculty and their knowledge and experience with diversity indicates a variety of examples. Many faculty members have done doctoral studies and dissertations involving diverse populations. Most have done research activities involving diverse populations. All but three have P-12 school teaching experience with diverse populations, while over half have P-12 administrative experience with diverse populations. A review of faculty vitae as well as faculty interviews support the data presented in the chart.

Interaction of candidates with diverse school faculty varies with the student teaching assignment. Certain field experience and clinical practice sites have diverse faculty while others do not. Demographic data on school faculty who serve as cooperating teachers for clinical practice are not collected by the unit.

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Fall 2003 enrollment data show a total of 610 candidates in the unit, 487 are females, 123 are males, 12 are African Americans, 17 are Asian/Pacific Islander, one is American Indian/Alaskan, 395 are Caucasian, 117 are Hispanic/Latino, five are Multiracial, and 63 declined to state. The table below shows demographic data for each program. TP refers to the Teacher Preparation program, TPSE refers to the Teacher Preparation program for Special Education,

C & G refers to the Counseling and Guidance program, C & I is the Curriculum and Instruction program, Admin refers to the Administrator Preparation program. TPSE, C & G, C & I, and Admin programs include both candidates seeking only the credential as well as those seeking the credential and the master's degrees.

Program	TP	TPSE	C&G	C&I	Admin	M Ed	Ed D
Total # of candidates	69	76	158	34	28	219	26
female	49	58	137	27	15	182	19
male	20	18	21	7	13	37	7
African-American	1	2	5			2	2
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	3	5	1	1	5	1
Caucasian		55	85	22	16	152	21
Hispanic	12	9	39		7	31	2
Native Amer./Alaskan							
Multiracial/other	1		2	6	1	1	2
Declined to state	11	7	22	3	3		

The university has made efforts to recruit a diverse student population. Current efforts are focused on recruiting Hispanic candidates since that is the predominant ethnic minority population in Ventura County. Efforts to recruit candidates from other ethnic minority populations are beginning. The school has a Title VII grant to provide funding to support full time bilingual candidates. The goal of the project is to qualify 15 credentialed bilingual teachers each year and help them find employment in the area. Tuition and book stipends are provided to the grant recipients. Advertising in local media such as the Los Angeles Times, Ventura Star, and radio spots is done on a regular basis. Advertising in Spanish newspapers in the Ventura area as well on Spanish speaking radio stations is also being done. The call-center on campus does have a Spanish speaker to answer phones and respond to inquiries about the various programs.

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

In terms of P-12 students and clinical practice, the diversity of the groups depend on the location of the placement. Candidates placed in the Rio School District in Oxnard see a predominantly Hispanic student population with a majority of students in a free/reduced lunch program. Candidates in Thousand Oaks and Simi Valley schools see a predominantly Caucasian student population with a growing minority population, mainly Hispanic, with some students on a free/reduced lunch program. Additional districts used in field experiences and clinical practice, such as Los Angeles Unified Districts A and B, Fillmore, Oak

Park, and Moorpark, reflect varying degrees of diversity. Candidates can submit a request to complete student teaching at specific school sites; however, efforts are made by the coordinator to place teacher preparation candidates in two different school settings during the introductory and final phases of clinical practice. While the program does record where a candidate is placed for clinical practice, there is no data available to verify that all teacher candidates have been given experience working in diverse settings.

Candidates in advanced programs are required to have experiences with diverse populations. Field experience with diverse students are documented by the candidate and verified by the site personnel, but data on where the experience is conducted are not aggregated by the programs.

Overall Assessment of Standard

All education programs at both the initial and advanced levels embed diversity across the curriculum. Candidates at both levels demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity through a variety of assessments. It is apparent that candidates are placed in settings with diverse student populations. Data on candidate placement in both initial and advanced programs are collected, but the data are not aggregated at this point. Efforts to recruit a diverse faculty and student population are ongoing and plans have been developed to further expand these efforts.

C. Recommendation: met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

> *Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.*

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Qualified Faculty

There are 22.5 full-time faculty members in the unit. One-half of the full time faculty, who come from diverse professional backgrounds, were hired in the last five years. All of the full time faculty hold a doctorate degree with the exception of two clinical faculty. Clinical faculty is a special category to define unranked faculty hired on a limited term basis. The clinical faculty bring unusual expertise to the unit in terms of math, bilingual and technology knowledge and skills. Faculty credentials illustrate a professionally diverse faculty with academic preparation from diverse institutions nationally and internationally. A matrix was presented illustrating the vast and different P-12 experiences of at least 90 percent of the full time faculty. Such data served to support their qualifications in content and professional knowledge.

An institutional report exhibit titled *Faculty Experience in Applied Educational Settings* presents the practical educational related experiences of twenty-four unit faculty. The applied settings exhibit and a listing of scholarly faculty activities appeared to be aligned with the teacher education and school personnel programs offered by the unit. Not only were these activities aligned with the teacher education curriculum, but a high level of faculty and school personnel collaboration was noted throughout discussions of scholarly activities and presentations. As stated, 90 percent of full time faculty have experiences in P-12 settings. Faculty with recent school related experiences make up one half of the faculty. The recent experiences noted occurred during the last five years. These experiences range from classroom teaching to serving as curriculum directors and school superintendents.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Unit faculty, sensitive to crucial educational issues, exhibit this sensitivity in syllabi, professional writing, presentations, and grants. During the faculty interview process, several topics related to social justice and multicultural concerns were discussed by faculty. It was clear that they exhibited a high degree of intellectual inquisitiveness and vitality. The interview process also allowed examiners to view a highly verbal faculty who exhibited characteristics of critical thinkers and reflective practitioners.

Faculty engage students through many classroom and internship experiences. In addition a portfolio process, with a high degree of reflection and feedback, demonstrate modeling of best practices. Most unit faculty are comfortable with technology and use it to enhance not only student learning but for their own professional growth. The external professional community gave extremely positive comments on the teaching and service provided by unit faculty.

Assessment and technology as best practices was evident in varied syllabi. Varied documents illustrated faculty concern for student learning and the assessment of their learning.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

The scholarship of discovery appears to characterize the work of many unit faculty. Their research and scholarly activities integrate into classroom teaching, service activities, grantsmanship and onsite faculty development. Resumes identified a range of faculty publications. It was also apparent that faculty present at regional and national meetings, often engaging a peer or student in the process. In reviewing syllabi and resumes, quite often evidence of cutting edge education thinking is noted. Innovation appears to result from an intellectually vital community of scholars in the unit. Research and scholarship is a goal of support staff as well as faculty and students. Senior administrators also engage in scholarly activities. Thus, the expectation and modeling of best practices in scholarship is a part of the unit culture.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Faculty expectations clearly delineated in the faculty appraisal documents require faculty to engage in service activities. Interviews with faculty indicated that they value such activities. Resumes revealed that at least 70 percent of faculty are engaged in community service activities. In addition, the external professional community indicated expectations that faculty from the unit would provide services to P-12 schools. The relationship between P-12 personnel and unit faculty appeared strong and collaborative. Services from faculty range from serving on community committees to providing reading instruction expertise to area schools.

Collaboration

Grant activity and scholarship have been fused into a research agenda by many of the unit faculty at both the initial and advanced level. As unit faculty pursue research ands scholarship agendas, they collaborate with many practitioners from area schools. Quite often, it appears that these relationships form from practitioner participation on varied unit committees and councils. The listing below indicates a range of groups and school participants. The 178 participating school participants are a tribute to the collaborative and inquiry based characteristic of the unit.

Group or Committee	Type of Involvement/Role	Number of School Participants
School of Education Advisory Committee	Advisory to the Unit	39 Teachers, Principals, Superintendents
PT 3 Project: Magnetic Connections	Grant advisory group	7 principals and tech coordinator
Mathematics Project Grants	Practitioners-advisory, grade level presenters and workshop presenters	18 directors of C&I, teachers, math specialist, assistant and associate superintendents
Title VII Professional Development Grant: "Competent Bilingual Teacher"	Advisory	3 manager and special projects director
Teacher Education Practitioners	Support teacher education and part-time faculty	15 teachers, principals, and BTSA Support?
PDS Partnerships	School Personnel Support	10 principals and teachers
Program Development	Involvement with program development	8 school personnel, principals, directors and teachers
Administrative Masters and Credentialing Program Redesign	Advisory	15 assistant superintendents
CARES Project	Advisory	7 school counselors
New Pupil Personnel Standards	Advisory	6 counselors, principal and magnet coordinator
California Reading and Literature	Grant advisory group	11 directors, assistant and associate superintendents, teachers
California Reading and Literature Project	Teacher Leaders	19 teachers, reading specialist, and coordinators
	Total Number of School Personnel and Practitioners involved with Unit	**178**

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

The presentation of the knowledge-base, syllabi, and faculty course evaluations provide evidence of the pedagogical and content knowledge of unit faculty at both the initial and advance level. A self appraisal of Scholarly and Professional Growth in the 2nd, 4th and 6th year review further serve as evidence of faculty knowledge as well as scholarship. A post-tenure review is administered every seven years. Interviews with administrators and faculty provided evidence that the appraisal processes are valued. Faculty indicate the seriousness of such endeavors and the value of this activity was noted in the several exhibits ranging from a faculty electronic portfolio to several hard copy review portfolios. Built into the self appraisal process is a peer appraisal component which allows a peer

colleague to assess and provide feedback for the faculty member. This formal review process includes self, peer, student and administrative review as well as an Appointment, Rank, and Tenure committee (ART) review.

Faculty, in appraising their scholarly and professional growth, are queried as to the inclusion of students in their scholarly and creative activities. It was evident in faculty portfolios and interviews that student learning was valued. Faculty regularly and systematically involve students in their research and grant projects. Research and scholarly presentations provide indicators that faculty value candidate learning. Poster sessions and webfolios provide additional evidence of faculty engagement in student learning. During interviews with faculty and students, it was evident that they were excited about the reflective and engaging webfolio process in which students can receive electronic feedback. The webfolio as well as many other unit educational initiatives emerge from the scholarship and research of unit faculty.

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Faculty interviews as well as exhibits provided evidence that faculty participate in a wide range of professional development opportunities. It appeared that at least 95 percent of faculty are engaged in professional development activities. Varied institutional report exhibits indicate that professional development is part of the culture of the unit. These professional development opportunities often foster not only the growth of the individual faculty but peers as well. It was not unusual to locate a program presentation bearing the names of several faculty. At the same time, documentation clearly showed that most faculty have developed a professional identity by their scholarship and expertise.

The use of webfolio process encourages reflective activities. It was apparent from faculty and student interviews at both the initial and advanced levels that reflection was valued and modeled by faculty. Students maintain logs and journals and these documents provide for enhanced faculty and student communication regarding reflections and feedback. Consistent across the unit is the use of forms to encourage reflective thinking both on the part of students and faculty.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The culture and spirit of the twenty-two faculty members, students and support staff clearly demonstrate a professional and scholarly engaged community. Intellectual vitality was demonstrated throughout interviews and interactions. The professional endeavors and achievements of a highly qualified and collaborative faculty were noted in the exhibits detailing credentials, experiences, grants, publications and other professional endeavors. Extensive technology professional development was also noted both delivered by unit faculty and then external participation with other groups across the country.

C. **Recommendation:** Met in initial and advanced

D. **Areas for Improvement: None**

Standard 6.   Unit Governance and Resources

> *The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

A. Level: initial and advanced

B. Findings:

<u>Unit Leadership and Authority</u>

The School of Education, one of three academic units within the University, is administered by a dean, an associate dean and two department chairs. Dean Carol Bartell, appointed in 1995, resigned from California Lutheran in October of 2003 to take a position at another California institution, leaving her Associate Dean, Mildred Murray-Ward as the Acting Dean.   The Dean of the School of Education has the authority and responsibility for the unit.

When Dr. Bartell began her tenure, the School of Education was organized by programs. The department structure was added in 1998 through the formation of the Department of Teacher Education and the Department of Advanced Studies. There are also program chairs for each of the six major program areas. Each department chair also serves as a program director.

While the School of Education as autonomy in some ways, California Lutheran operates within a strong system of faculty governance. Were the unit to design a major program addition or change, they would first give approval in the School of Education. The provost, advised of this process by the dean, would take the proposal to the Academic Council (deans and program directors) who would look at budget, curricular and market issues, among others.   The proposal would then go to the Graduate Professional Education Committee for review (or the EPPC in the case of undergraduate programming). This body would put the proposal out for full faculty discussion. After thirty days of review, the full faculty would vote on the proposal. This system was successfully used for the recent approval of the Ed.D program in Educational Administration.

In the School of Education, the unit faculty meets as a whole once a month. Department meetings and program area meetings are held monthly. The dean also convenes a meeting monthly of the Dean's Cabinet, a group comprised of the associate dean, the department chairs, and the program directors. Program directors are responsible for the program administration, evaluation and evaluation. Department chairs, on 11 month contracts, provide coordination for related programs in their departments. Each also serves as a program chair of one of the six program areas.

The collaborative body of external constituents which advises the School of Education is the Advisory Committee which meets once each semester. This group is comprised of principals, superintendents, teachers, and others educational specialists. Members report that they provide feedback to the SOE. Other constituents also advise the SOE. A task force was appointed to inform the design of the Ed.D. Educational Administration program. Adjunct faculty (lecturers) also meet twice a year and report that they, too, are encouraged to collaborate. The new PDS principal and faculty are also beginning to advise program review and development.

Catalogs, university, and School of Education publications are current and accurate. Candidates report that advising and unit services meet their needs.

Unit Budget

Comparative budgetary information demonstrates that the resources of the School Education are in alignment with those of the School of Business and the College of Arts and Science. Budget allocations for the School of Education have increased 57% in the last five years. Salaries in the academic units at CLU are comparable, as are library, technology, and professional development funds. The library allocation budget has increased over the last seven years. Salaries have increased at a rate of 5 percent or more in the last five years as the University moves to make salaries competitive. For instance, the budget for SOE faculty salaries in 1998-99 was $658,893. The budget in 2002-2003 was $1,082,450. Comparisons with like colleges and universities in the area finds salaries at California Lutheran on the high end of the "middle range" grouping. (Higher salaries are available in a grouping which registers above CLU and its like institutions).

Discussion with the Provost and Vice President for Finance revealed a budget process that is balanced and fair. Allotments for schools are determined after multiple factors are considered: number of courses offered, numbers of programs, credit hours generated, majors and program expenses. Deans have some latitude to make decisions about the use of funds in their unit.

The School of Education has also added resources through grant money. As many as 20 grants have been secured by the unit in the past five years, with 10 grants still active. These grants have provided programmatic and material support to the School of Education.

Personnel

Faculty in the School of Education are contracted for 12 hours per semester. Workload reports, in most cases, demonstrate that there is adherence to this policy. Overloads among faculty are discouraged, though it does occur on occasion. Department Chairs receive a one course release per semester. Program Chairs receive an overload credited to the summer. Faculty may be "bought out" for courses when working on grants. Full time faculty also are often engaged in supervision of candidates. For a methods block, a supervisor is granted 1 unit of

credit per three candidates; for three student teachers, two units of credit are earned.   One unit of credit per semester is earned for five interns, who are supervised for four semesters.   This is a very active faculty. The workload, though heavy on the teaching side, seems to allow faculty to be actively engaged in scholarship, service and teaching.

Dean Bartell, working with the provost, worked hard in the last few years to increase the number of full time faculty in relationship to part time faculty. Her goal was to reach a figure of 60 percent for full time faculty. The unit averages 40 full time faculty per semester to the 22.5 part time faculty.

Faculty lines for the School of Education have been maintained and added in the last few years. Adjunct faculty, however, are highly qualified and serve the unit well. They are supported through mentorship and evaluation.

The School of Education benefits from an excellent support staff.   There is a director of support services, a director of student services, a credential analyst, an administrative assistant to the Dean and administrative secretaries for each of the two departments.   An administrative secretary serves as a receptionist and placement secretary.

Unit Facilities

The unit is housed in a spacious new 20,000 square foot facility opened in 2002. Each faculty has a well equipped office with a computer.   A Macintosh and PC lab serve as smart classrooms. Conference rooms are available for meetings and seminars. Work space and equipment which serve the production of documents are state-of-the-art.   Classes are often held in other campus buildings where technology based instruction is possible.

The unit also has satellite campuses in Woodland Hills and Ventura, where significant improvements have occurred in the last few years.   A special academy partnership with the Los Angeles Unified School District exists at John Marshall High School. The unit is investigating moving that program, however, to another facility.

Unit Resources Including Technology

This is a technology rich program, in part because of the completion of the new facility and in part because of university and faculty commitment to the use of technology in instruction.   All faculty have networked computers which are replaced on a three year cycle. Over 50 percent of classrooms have permanent projection systems with internet connected computers.   Technology and Teamwork, CLU's two year project funded by a grant from the Charles E. Culpepper Foundation, assisted 24 faculty redesign courses.

The School of Education has also made use of distance learning tools including Tapped-In, a virtual learning environment and ClearPhone Internet video conferencing.

The library is progressive in its use of technology. The library, which holds 130,000 volumes and 450 journal subscriptions, also has 60 subscription database services. Educational databases include ERIC, Mental Measurements Yearbook, netLibrary, ProQuest Direct, PsychArticles, PsychInfo, Wilson Education and WorldCat.

A gift from Sage-Corwin Publishing has allowed the education collection to expand by 640 volumes in the last year.

<u>Overall Assessment of Standard</u>

The unit clearly has the leadership and authority to direct the unit. The addition of an Associate Dean position in the summer of 2003 will help with the collection of unit data. Personnel have been added in the last five years and salaries have increased. The addition of the 6.2 million dollar facility demonstrates the university's commitment to teacher education at California Lutheran. In a time when budgets are "stressed," the unit at California Lutheran has the resources and university support it needs to prepare qualified candidates.

C.   Recommendation: Met

D.   Areas for Improvement: None

Report to the California Committee on Accreditation

Accreditation Visit to California Lutheran University

November 15-19, 2003

Background Information:

In November 1999, a merged visit by NCATE and COA teams visited California Lutheran University (CLU). The COA report recommended accreditation of all credential programs operated by CLU, with two substantive stipulations:

"That the University provide evidence of policies and a plan to encourage the admission of students from under-represented groups and to recruit faculty who reflect cultural and linguistic diversity in order to better respond to the multicultural and multilingual public school region it serves."

"That the University provide evidence that sufficient resources are being allocated to improve the facilities for the School of Education, to recruit and retain faculty and to increase faculty professional development."

A re-visit was conducted a year later and the team found that the items covered in the stipulations had been appropriately addressed, and recommended that the stipulations be removed. The recommended action was taken by the COA.

At the original visit, the report by the NCATE Board of Examiners recommended initial accreditation for CLU. However the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE did not accept that recommendation and denied accreditation. CLU reapplied for initial accreditation and the current merged visit has been for that purpose. The merged team has again reviewed the programs at CLU and is recommending to the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board that initial accreditation be granted.

Since the accreditation of credential programs by the COA is still in effect, and CLU is not scheduled for another visit for some time, it was determined that the state team members of the current merged visit would evaluate credential programs for the purpose of assisting in collecting data and in recommending the NCATE accreditation status. Also, it was decided that it would be appropriate to provide to the COA a brief update on the CLU credential programs. Basically, this report provides a formative summary and report of changes, a listing of program strengths, and recommendations to the faculty of the program.

Program: Basic Credentials---Multiple and Single Subject

Formative Summary/Report of Changes: The Basic Cluster Credential Programs (Multiple and Single Subject) have made varied and significant changes to more effectively prepare teachers to meet the needs of California public school students. Currently, program and course goals, experiences, and expectations have been restructured to align with the SB 2042 Professional Preparation Standards. In addition, all components of teacher preparation are driven by the School of Education conceptual framework known to all candidates and faculty as STRIVE. This philosophical approach provides the scaffolding for the development of 'reflective, principled educators'. Other important program enhancements include the following:

- ClU developed of a web-based electronic portfolio assessment system.
- To assist in systematic assessment of candidate performance, the CLUEs portfolio was conceived. After several years, CLUEs became a web-based portfolio developed by candidates as they select artifacts to demonstrate reaching the benchmarks of the program. The portfolio can be converted to an employment portfolio upon program completion.
- An Elementary Level Professional Development School site has been developed.
- CLU has established membership in an IHE consortium to support interns.
- Development of a blended multiple subject program is still in the review process.

Program Strengths: Candidates in the basic credential programs are provided with multiple opportunities for individual interaction and guidance. The programs are designed with benchmarks to ensure candidate success at each level before progressing. Candidates are provided with experiences that enhance their ability to use technology as an instructional tool. Faculty model best practices in the methods classes required of all candidates. As evidenced by interviews during the site visit, teachers recommended for credentials by CLU have a reputation in the area as well-prepared and caring professionals. Most candidates are hired immediately upon program completion.

Recommendations: Review of the basic credential programs yielded multiple indications that CLU is doing an admirable job of preparing candidates to enter the teaching ranks in California. However, one area of concern surfaced during the review. The evidence indicates that single subject candidates may or may not receive sufficient support in developing subject specific pedagogy. To enhance the development of single subject credential candidates, including interns, the School of Education is urged to develop strategies and/or provide resources to ensure that all single subject candidates have multiple opportunities to receive support from subject area specialists while completing the credential program.

Program: Education Specialist Credentials----Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe

Formative Summary/Report of Changes: Special Education programs have been offered at CLU since 1975. At the time of the 1999 visit, the new credential programs at Level I were fully operational; the Level II programs was just being initiated, and the Internship programs were being initiated. Development of the internship program was in response to the identified needs of the area school districts that were faced with a chronic shortage of special education teachers. A significant number of changes have occurred that have had positive effects on the programs:
• A new Education and Technology building provides individual faculty offices and a private setting for advising candidates. The new facility also provides state-of –the-art technological equipment.
• All candidates from "old" programs have completed or been transitioned into the current credential programs.
• A team of "core" adjunct faculty members has been created. The adjunct faculty brings consistency and stability to the instructional program, and provides support from field-based individuals to the two full time faculty members.
• Candidates are surveyed every semester to get feedback on different issues. Curricular changes have been made in response to this feedback.
• Program evaluation data and observations indicate that the programs are attracting young, enthusiastic individuals to the program in addition to individuals who are returning to college to complete a credential program.
• Good progress has been made in the use of Webfolio as a formative and summative assessment tool.

Program Strengths: The Education Specialist credential programs have a number of strengths. Of particular note are the following:
• The Special Education faculty has two well-qualified and enthusiastic members who have close relationships with their candidates.
• The programs appear to have a strong course structure.

Recommendations:
• Give priority effort to recruitment of candidates to the programs. This will assist the local school districts in resolving their shortage of qualified teachers for special education programs, and will help eliminate the problem of low class enrollment at CLU.
• Target some recruitment efforts to para-professionals who are working in special education programs. This can increase program enrollment and should increase the diversity of the candidates in the programs.
• Assign the full time faculty members to field supervision in both mild/moderate and moderate/severe special classes at least once each year to maintain and enhance knowledge of public school programs for students with a wide variety of disabilities.

Program: School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance

Formative Summary/Report of Changes: The Counseling and Guidance Program in the School of Education administers the Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) Credential School Counseling Specialization Program and the Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA) Specialization Certificate Program. Both programs are approved by the Committee on Accreditation (COA). The School Counseling Specialization Program, approved by the COA Spring 2002, began offering course work for the "new" program September 2002. Additionally the University offers a College Student Personnel Services Program. A total of 204 candidates participate in the programs.

Faculty responded to graduate and administrator suggestions, as well as research related to best practices, in responding to national standards and state Counseling and Guidance standards. Curriculum changes included the addition of four new courses, and redesign of all other courses.
Addition of a research course enhances candidates' ability to design and evaluate standards-based counseling and guidance programs. Issues of diversity and increased understanding of self in relation to others different from the candidate are infused throughout course content and assignment, particularly in reflective activities. The new program increases the focus on collaboration with school, families, and community agencies in assessing and meeting the needs of students. Changes resulted in an increase in practicum experience hours and units from 39 to 48.

Candidates are now required to submit a Certificate of Clearance and CBEST passing score upon program admission, thus avoiding facing these requirements before beginning field experiences.

A new position of Fieldwork Coordinator has been approved for the spring 2004 semester. This position was designed to improve the process of field placement, monitoring candidate progress, and providing data that can guide effectiveness of placements.

Candidates now prepare and maintain an electronic portfolio that is used as an on-going communication tool with faculty. The electronic portfolio facilitates evaluation and exit assessment of candidates, and provides an avenue for program tracking and effectiveness data.

Program Strengths: Interviews with candidates, graduates (of the "old" program) and faculty and a review of documents of the new PPS and CWA Programs indicate that
• Faculty are highly qualified and accessible.
• Program faculty respect written and oral feedback from candidates, graduates (of the "old" program), practitioners, and site administrators, and is used to guide program
 change.
• Candidates feel that faculty are attentive to the needs of working professionals.

- Graduates are well prepared to serve varied roles in counseling and guidance with confidence.
- Strong linkages between theory and practice facilitate candidate learning
- Course work is designed to address the collaborative, leadership, and advocacy roles of the school counselor in addition to strong counseling skill development.
- Collaboration with selected elementary schools enables candidates to gain experience with high risk students.
- The program has highly qualified adjunct faculty that includes practitioners.
- CLU has developed and implemented a Counseling and Guidance website.

Recommendations: The program coordinator reports several primary considerations for increased program effectiveness. As the Pupil Personnel Services Counseling and Guidance Credential Program undergoes the change from "old" to "new" standards it will be important to continue an emphasis on communication with students regarding differing requirements.

Continued training, on-going communication with, and supervision of the adjunct faculty should include their participation in use of the electronic portfolio for student assessment.

The program coordinator and faculty should further refine their processes for collecting program evaluation and candidate progress data, including graduate follow-up, employer evaluation of program effectiveness, and advisory committee recommendations. Data analysis could then inform continuing program development and change.

Program: Educational Administration: Credential and Degree Programs (Internship, Preliminary, and Professional)

Formative Summary/Report of Changes: The credential and degree programs continue to function effectively. Since the 1999 visit, there have been continuing efforts to increase opportunities and improve the preparation of candidates in the programs. Of particular note are the following:
- Faculty members have reviewed the sequence of courses, and continue to provide a coherent course sequence.
- Candidates complete the teacher supervision seminar and fieldwork studies in the final two semesters of coursework.
- The admissions process has been improved, utilizing several forms of assessment—including a writing requirement regarding the conceptual framework, interview questions correlated with program goals, letters of recommendation, transcript analysis, etc.
- The department has developed closer relationships with local district administrators.
- The department has invited input as to program effectiveness from local district administrators.

- Recent faculty hires have added another dimension to the department, bringing district office and higher education experience to the team.
- Facilities and equipment have been greatly improved.

The Educational Administration program is currently being restructured to meet the new CTC and ISSLC standards. Fieldwork experiences will be embedded within the coursework, and candidates will be required to demonstrate proficiency in meeting the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs) through a portfolio defense at the end of their coursework.

A new doctoral program in Educational Leadership has been developed and implemented. While this is not part of the credential program in Educational Administration, the doctoral program offers an opportunity for advanced study to graduates of the credential program, and it contributes, indirectly, to its quality.

The doctoral program was developed over a two-year period of time, with intensive involvement of CLU faculty and administration, public school personnel, and assistance by an outside facilitator. The program is based on CLU's Conceptual Framework, values and mission statement. It was designed to be a broad program of educational leadership to include a population of leaders in a variety of professional positions that relate to numerous areas of education.

The doctoral program has primary involvement of five faculty members from the School of Education and also involves faculty members from other disciplines. The faculty has identified five major strands for the program: research, leadership, theory, ethical considerations, and preparation for the dissertation.

The program is organized on a cohort model. This encourages collaboration among the candidates and support for each other. The first cohort has 14 candidates who have just completed their first year in the program. The second cohort has recently begun course work and includes 15 candidates. These cohorts include individuals with interests in public school administration, higher education, community college administration, counseling, and school health programs. One objective of CLU is to admit a cohort of 20 individuals each year.

Program Strengths: The credential program in Educational Administration has a number of strengths. Of particular note are the following:

- The department has enthusiastic new faculty members who will add many dimensions of strength in the credential program and in the new doctoral program.
- The integration of the conceptual framework into the course structure and the assessment system of the School of Education that is being implemented are factors in improving the program.
- The development of the doctoral program is having a positive effect on the credential programs.

Recommendations:
- Explore the establishment of cohort groups in the Educational Administration credential program with different school districts in the service areas. This could possibly increase the enrollment that is needed to reduce the problem of low enrollment courses.
- Implement a plan to increase diversity in the programs.
- Involve practitioners from several districts in modifying the programs to meet the new CCTC standards.